THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE hard old dogmatic materialism, once so confidently pugnacious, has in recent times received many a shrewd knock. So much is this the case that it has now begun to be affirmed in religious circles that materialism as a tenable philosophy is dead. That, of course, remains to be seen.

The attack on materialism which has gained currency in our day comes, curiously enough, from the physicists. Their investigations into the constitution of matter have led them far past the solid indestructible atom, once the foundation stone of materialism, into dim and mysterious regions where matter appears to lose its solidity and reveal itself as essentially energy. This seems to cut away the ground from beneath the old materialism. As Eddington has said, 'What is the use of talking about materialism when we don't know what material is?'

The difficulty here is, that while it undoubtedly gives the quietus to the hard old materialism, it may lead to a materialism of a more refined and subtle type. Matter, it may be argued, is so mysterious, so full of energy, so capable of transforming itself into radiation, that it may well be counted capable of everything. It is Eddington who says, 'There is nothing to prevent the assemblage of atoms forming the brain from being itself a thinking machine *in virtue of that nature which physics leaves undetermined and undeterminable*.' The term 'materialism,' we may be sure, will not readily be given up, for it is the watchword of all who would exclude the spiritual from the realm of reality. In some form or other it will doubtless survive, as it does in the Marxian 'dialectic materialism,' though it involves a manifest logical contradiction.

A very interesting and informative book on this subject has been published under the title of *Science versus Materialism*, by Professor Reginald O. KAPP (Methuen; 10s. 6d. net). The title of the book is itself a challenge and indicates that the writer does not think materialism is scientifically sound. He has read widely and thought deeply and he applies a keenly logical mind to the problem. His book is more critical than constructive, but many of his points are well taken and he writes in a straightforward way that makes a strong appeal to one's common sense.

Professor KAPP is Professor of Electrical Engineering in the University of London and he writes throughout as an engineer. The dominance of this engineering mentality powerfully influences his thought. To him matter is an inert thing, just the raw material which the engineer has to mould and shape out of its natural chaos into forms of usefulness. Accordingly he holds the distinction between the animate and the inanimate to be perfectly rigid and absolute. He would have no sympathy with the doctrine, supported by weighty names, that there must be even in things inanimate a certain sensibility or power of selection in accordance with which they manifest various attractions and repulsions towards one another. Lord Bacon speaks of this as a 'perception far more subtle than sense,' and Spinoza held that all bodies, even the inanimate, were *animata* in varying degrees. To express this blind form of apprehension Whitehead coined the word 'prehend.'

The gist of Professor KAPP'S argument is that there are manifestly non-material forces at work in the animate world, that there is no potency in matter itself to impose order upon itself, or to combine into forms of higher complexity, or especially to produce the phenomena of life and mind. He regards the doctrine of 'emergent' evolution, at present looked upon with favour, as a clouding of the issue by the use of a question-begging word. Matter has no power inherent in itself to cause a higher than itself to emerge. Many doubtless implicitly take that doctrine as meaning that a non-material power causes the new and higher forms to emerge, but that, of course, is to give up materialism.

Materialists have laid great stress upon the influence of environment on the living organism, and in this connexion they scientifically prove what everybody knew and learnedly affirm what nobody ever denied. Some have been mightily impressed by what modern physicists have revealed of the influence of certain chemical substances in glands upon health, character, and life itself. This has seemed to imply that life is nothing but a by-product of chemical substances. But substantially all this was well known from earliest times. The rudest savage knows that a crack on the skull with a club produces unconsciousness and even death. He knows that a deficiency of blood or of air or of food reduces vitality and may be fatal. 'It has become the fashion among biologists to tell us that various recondite discoveries made by specialists reveal some new truth full of philosophical implications. And when we examine this revelation we find that it is something which was never doubted. Every one knew it already from everyday experience. Here even so eminent a scientist as the late J. S. Haldane succumbed to the prevailing fashion. He told us, in effect, that 'science is discovering "with ever-increasing clearness" that we suffocate if we lack air.' Of course we do. Of course we depend on our environment. But that does not prove that the living organism is solely the product of its environment.

The materialist is fond of arguing that if everything is not wholly determined then the alternative is chaos, a world in which anything may happen. But this does not by any means follow. Actions might be determined by higher laws than the laws of mechanics. They need not be chaotic. We must not begin by begging the question through the assumption that there are no other laws than the laws of physics and chemistry. Professor KAPP prefers to speak of living things as being 'doubly determinate,' that is, fully subject to the laws of physics and chemistry while at the same time responsive to the higher laws of life.

The principle of complete physical determinateness may itself be called in question. Science has never proved it and never can. 'Most physicists tend to believe in a principle of complete determinism, but they would be the first to admit that their belief is based on faith and not on fact. . . . There is no authority whatever for the assumption of such a principle. There is no experiment or observation, or piece of deductive reasoning to prove it. All that can be said is that its assumption has become so engrained in our habits of thought that few persons are prepared to give it up readily.' The principle has never been proved, and, now that physicists are able to scrutinize the fine structure of matter in the atom, Heisenberg has shown that there is an absolute limit to the accuracy of observation. In face of this it is sheer assertion to maintain that all action is rigidly determined by physical law.

The thoroughgoing materialist is fond of asserting that the living organism is simply a machine, and the answer of the theologian commonly is that the lowest of living creatures is more than a machine. That may be very true but the materialist may be more simply answered out of his own mouth. His analogy is a most unhappy one from his own point of view. For what is a machine? It is the product of human ingenuity. Thought, purpose, energy from a source outside itself have gone to its construction. It did not create itself out of a heap of scrap iron. Its existence postulates the skill and planning of the engineer. 'We should expect the mechanist to support his theory by pointing an analogy to rocks or stars or clouds, or perhaps to

crystals, or rivers, or atoms, to something belonging without a doubt to the rough, untouched world of lifeless things. If he did this we could follow his reasoning, even if we thought the resemblance only slight. But the mechanist does not do this. He says that living organisms are a part of the rough, untouched world of lifeless things because they are even less like this world than machines are. He says that living organisms are due to nothing but the unco-ordinated forces of Nature, because they resemble objects which are due to the carefully co-ordinated powers of man. . . . Surely this is the kind of logic which was taught in the Colleges of Unreason in the country of Erewhon described by Samuel Butler.'

Psychology, Psychotherapy and Evangelicalism (Allen & Unwin ; 10s. 6d. net), by J. G. McKenzie, D.D., Jesse Boot Professor in Social Science in Paton College, Nottingham, is meant to be a contribution to the better understanding of Evangelical experience and doctrine. Those who are acquainted with this author's work and writings know that he is more interested in a theology based on psychology than in the theology based on logic. In the attractive volume before us, in which he applies psychological and psychotherapeutic principles to a particular type of religious experience, he trusts to have given the theologian something to work upon.

The book falls into three parts. Part I. would justify the application of psychology and psychotherapy to Evangelical experience and doctrine, and outline the essence of Evangelicalism. Part II. begins the contribution proper, treating of salvation and its various problems. Part III. seeks to carry the discussion into the doctrinal as distinguished from the experiential sphere and also to show how psychology may be applied in Church work. It is the discussion in Part I. of the essence of Evangelicalism to which we would here invite our readers' attention.

It is first observed that, from the psychological point of view, there is nothing that binds Evangelicalism to any particular regulative creed. Freedom is the keynote of Evangelicalism. If Evangelical doctrine tends to be a hard conservatism, it is a tendency which besets doctrine in general. 'Bishop Barnes is proud to belong to the Evangelical tradition, and although it is difficult to imagine him delivering one of his trenchant addresses on the Keswick platform, he would not fail to make contact if he were speaking at a convention on personal religion.'

It is by his experience, and not by any intellectual emphasis, that the Evangelical is distinguished from other types. What unites all Evangelicals, and indeed enables them to be placed in one class, is an experience which they believe to be of God's grace as mediated through Christ. It is an experience, to cite terms used in psychotherapy, which is not merely 'recognition' but 'realization'; or which the philosopher calls not simply 'knowledge by description' but 'knowledge by acquaintance.' It is this realization, this knowledge by acquaintance, which is an experience of an immediate kind, not reached by methods of ratiocination, that the great leaders of the Evangelical Movement attempted to evoke, and which the Evangelical preacher also attempts to evoke to-day. And here is the source of Evangelical fervour.

To note the theological emphasis of the Evangelical will help us to gain a clearer idea of Evangelical experience. The Person of Christ and His Work and the Authority of the Bible are the axes round which the theology revolves. However great the differences among Evangelicals on these subjects, their centrality is acknowledged by all.

As for the Person of Christ, the Evangelical sees Christ not, as in humanistic views, as a point which humanity may one day reach, but as the creator of the new humanity; He is not the projection of man's highest hopes, but the objective power of God seeking the fulfilment of His eternal purposes. He is the window, as Brunner, for example, expresses it, through which we can see God ; this is His significance, and His alone. Whereas for Troeltsch, and the humanistic interpreters generally, Christian experience is a fellowship of ideals or hopes, moral

and spiritual; for the Evangelicals, on the other hand, it is a fellowship with 'the living Christ,' the Word of God incarnate.

As for the Work of Christ, it is the Evangelical alone who makes the Cross crucial for the conviction of man's sin and need, and the all-sufficiency of God's sacrifice to meet that need. Theologically the question is, How can the sinner be justified before God? Psychologically it runs, How can the sinner enter into filial relations with God? The various theories of the Atonement show how the Cross answers this theological and psychological question. As far as Evangelicals are concerned the fundamental question has remained the same, whatever be the interpretation of the Cross. All feel that on the Cross something was done; the Cross exhibits something objective, something that happens in God as well as in man.

As for the authority of the Bible, there is much divergency among Evangelicals, ranging from the 'verbal inspiration' of the Fundamentalists to Burkitt's position that 'there is in the Gospel history . . . an element which Christians cannot discount if they are to remain Christians.' But practically all the Evangelical churches feel the need for a restatement of the doctrine of Biblical authority. Principal D. S. Cairns puts the modern Evangelical approach to Scripture in a way that leaves to it its unique authority, and yet encourages a reverent scholarship: 'The Bible is not the Revelation, but the record of the Revelation; it is not an inspired record of history, but the record of an inspired history.'

The latest 'Burge Memorial Lecture' was delivered at Oxford recently by Mr. Arnold J. Toynbee, and has been published under the title *Christianity and Civilization* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). It contains a striking and original historical review, which seems at first far removed from our present situation, but as a matter of fact bears closely on it. Mr. Toynbee begins with Gibbon's view of the subject, that Christianity was the destroyer of the civilization within whose framework it grew up. It was the age of the Antonines, and Gibbon's conviction was that that age was the flower and peak of the Græco-Roman culture, and that it began to decline from that point, and that it was Christianity as well as barbarism that overthrew it.

Of course Gibbon admired the pagan ideals of that civilization, and to him Christianity stood for its antithesis. Christianity meant religious self-seeking, saving one's own soul, whereas in the pagan civilization the State was supreme and the individual existed, and regarded himself as existing, solely for the State. Græco-Roman society was built on the conception that the safety of the community was the supreme aim of conduct, above the safety of the individual. The citizens, therefore, trained in this unselfish ideal, were ready to lay down their lives for the common good. This idea was shattered by the insistence of Christianity on the salvation of the soul as the only object worth living for. And the glorious era of the Antonines was eclipsed by the 'spiritual' aims of a selfish religion.

Another view, which does not seem incompatible with Gibbon's, and which must be very welcome to the Totalitarian powers, which, indeed, is very much that of Herr Rosenberg, is that religion is a kind of interlude between much greater and worthier systems. The Græco-Roman system was followed by the Christian, and what we see to-day is the revival of the older civilization which has sprung up out of the ruins of the once powerful Christian religion. Christianity is fading away. Its day is almost done. And in its place a new system in which again the State is supreme has appeared, not so much new as renewed, the classical conception, in which the Commonwealth is everything and the individual, in and for himself, nothing.

This view Mr. Toynbee regards as false reading of history. He contends, with many illustrative examples, that the rises and falls of civilizations are subsidiary to the growth of religion. Time after time we see a religion rising from the ruins of a secular civilization. These secular systems come and go, but religion pursues its upward way. 'If

religion is a chariot, it looks as if the wheels on which it mounts towards Heaven may be the periodic downfalls of civilizations on earth.' The movement of civilization is cyclic and recurrent, while the movement of religion is on a single upward continuous line.

This opens up a startling view of history. Civilizations are the handmaids of religion, and bring it to birth before they go to pieces. And the recurrence of civilizations of the same type are 'vain repetitions of the Gentiles.' It is the function of civilizations to serve, by their downfalls, as stepping-stones to a progressive process of the revelation of always deeper religious insight. If this be true (and Mr. TOYNBEE adduces convincing historical evidence of it), then the great event of these days is not our modern secular civilization. It is still the Crucifixion and its spiritual consequences. And, because the line of religion is continuous and upward and the line of secular systems is cyclic and recurrent, we may expect that Christianity will grow in wisdom and stature as the result of a fresh experience of secular catastrophe.

And Mr. TOYNBEE goes on to an interesting speculation, that Christianity will gather into itself all that is best in the other religions. He sees in the 'mythical passions' of Tammuz and Adonis and Attis and Osiris a foreshadowing of the Passion of Christ. And he looks for a time when 'in some city of the Far East' there will take place an infusion of Chinese philosophy into Christianity. It is possible that Christianity drew out of, and inherited from, the other Oriental religions the heart of what was best in them. And, if so, the present religions of India may contribute new elements to be grafted on to Christianity in days to come.

And then one may look forward to what may happen when Cæsar's empire decays—and it always does decay after a run of a few hundred years. What may happen is that Christianity may be left as the spiritual heir of all the other higher religions, from the post-Sumerian rudiment of one in the worship of Tammuz and Ishtar down to those that in A.D. 1940 are still living separate lives side by side with Christianity, and of all the philosophies from Ikhnaton's to Hegel's, while the Christian Church as an institution may be left as the social heir of all the other churches and all the civilizations.

This Patmos vision rather takes our breath away. But it is soberly, gravely and persuasively argued. And it raises the question: Supposing this were to happen, would it mean that the Kingdom of Heaven would then have been established on the earth? Is this the form the millennium will take? Christ, in a sense, all in all? Mr. TOYNBEE does not think so. And chiefly for two reasons. One is that, so far as we can see, man will always bear in himself the taint of original sin. The replacement of a multiplicity of civilizations by a universal church would not have purged human nature of this taint. And so long as original sin remains in human nature Cæsar will always have work to do.

The other reason is that the institutional element in the Church will always be a drag, its hierarchy and its organizations and its forms. Even if these be an indispensable means of survival, they are a mundane element that makes the Church militant's life different from the Kingdom of Heaven. Thus, even if the Church had won a fully wide-world allegiance and had entered into the inheritance of the last of the civilizations and of all the other higher religions, the Church on earth would not be a perfect embodiment here on earth of the Kingdom of Heaven. She would still have sin to contend with, and also a panoply of institutions to give her the massive social solidity that she needs in the mundane struggle for survival, but this at the inevitable price of spiritually weighing her down.

And, a last word, that answers Gibbon about the selfishness of the Christian aim—In what sense and in what way can we think of progress in regard to this growingly victorious Christianity? The answer is that progress here means a growing likeness to God, a growing salvation for the soul therefore. But because it is an approach to God it means love, and love of our fellows as well as of God. The salvation of the soul is not self-regarding. It is social because it is Godlike. God is spirit, and spirit is fellowship, and to know God and be like Him is to love others as we love Him.

Spiritual Problems and the War.

I. Introductory Article.

By Principal W. Fulton, D.D., Trinity College, Glasgow.

Spiritual problems are always with us, but in a time of war they are apt to press upon us with new insistence and in new forms. The foundations seem to be shaken, perhaps as never before, and hearts are full of perplexity. It is a time in which Christian thinkers might well examine and reaffirm the principles of the Christian faith.

Accordingly, the editors of this magazine are arranging for a series of topical articles to be published in succeeding issues. They have given me an indication of the subjects they have in view, with an invitation to write a short Introductory Article.

I take it that 'spiritual' in the title of the series is not to be equated with 'religious,' but is to include at least 'moral.' Thus the 'problems' to be considered will fall roughly into the two groups of religious and moral, or, to put it otherwise, theological and ethical. They will be problems relating on the one hand to belief and on the other to practice. Yet it will not be forgotten that from the Christian standpoint there is no hard-and-fast division between these two groups or categories.

The great spiritual problem of evil, in which war is so large a factor, does not arise in the lower levels of culture. There a theological explanation is ready to hand. Under polydæmonism, with its animistic view of Nature, the world is conceived as subject to a multitude of spirits both good and evil, who limit each other, and indeed are themselves limited by the natural environment; and under polytheism, with its larger horizons, the world is conceived as subject to a multitude or rather hierarchy of gods (as distinguished from spirits or godlings), who again limit each other, and who are themselves subject to fate or necessity, or govern a world already given and never properly under their control. So that on the lower levels of culture the good and evil in human experience are explained by reference to the divine background.

In a dualistic system of belief, such as we may find in the historical religion of Persia, there is also a theological explanation ready to hand. But there is now a truer sense of the world-order, the world being represented as the scene of a grand conflict between the two divine principles of good and evil.

It is only at the stage of monotheistic religion that the problem of evil arises in real and acute form. In the developed religion of the Old Testament we find the author of Job wrestling with it, and wrestling in vain. Nor even in New Testament religion is any solution offered; there we are apparently told that evil is to be subdued rather than explained: 'Be of good cheer,' says Jesus, 'I have overcome the world.' And through the redemption wrought by Christ His followers also gain the victory over evil.

When, after New Testament times, the Christian religion was expounded theistically with the aid of Greek philosophy, the pressure of the problem of evil was felt even more acutely. Witness the old dilemma: 'If God is good, then is He not omnipotent; if God is omnipotent, then is He not good; if God is both good and omnipotent, whence then comes evil?'

The difficulty was eased but not removed by the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin, as classically expounded by St. Augustine. Put forward in the first instance in explanation of the universality of sin, this doctrine would at the same time offer an account of the origin both of sin and of suffering, both of moral and of physical or natural evil. Though it involves a theory (metaphysical freedom) which may throw some light on the origin of sin, it requires revision in several points, and the problem of suffering remains.

Undoubtedly this latter problem has been accentuated in the present war, with its large-scale brutalities and horrors. It obviously falls to be considered in any such series of articles as is here projected. As obviously, it is not an isolated problem. It enters, we might say, organically into the structure of theological doctrine. In particular, the theologian must reckon with the practical difficulties in the way of belief in Providence which result from the undiscriminating and inexorable incidence of disaster, disease, and death. Nor should he be unmindful of the theoretical difficulties too, though these do not so frequently beset the mind. For example, are we to say on a basis of faith in Providence that the disasters and calamities of war are directly willed or merely permitted by God?

But in considering the conception of Providence we are sooner or later faced with the question of

destiny, whether of the race or of the individual. On the one hand, believing that the world is in the eternal grasp of a holy, wise, and loving God, are we to cherish the hope of the City or Kingdom of God on earth? Or does the renewed outbreak of world war make us cease to think hopefully of the world and the progress of human society? Is the earth destined to be a constant battleground between good and evil? On the other hand, believing that the world is in the eternal grasp of a holy, wise, and loving God, must we not set that belief in the light of the Christian hope for the individual? How else can we say with St. Paul that to them that love God 'all things'—including as they must the hardships and miseries of war—'work together for good'? If our life in the present is not subject to blind mechanism or impersonal fate but is ruled and governed from beyond this world according to eternal purpose, is it not destined to issue in a truer and fuller life beyond, where God is?

It has been observed that prayer and providence are 'closely intertwined.' If we believe in the divine governance of life we naturally place our desires before the divine governor. And in time of war the impulse to pray is found in many hearts where it had been dormant or dead. But the subject of prayers in war-time is one on which good Christian guidance is needed, so full is it of special difficulty; and it will be therefore desirable that in addition to articles on Suffering, Providence, Progress, and Immortality, there should also be one on Prayer.

So much for religious or theological problems. But war is a large factor in the general problem of evil not only by reason of the physical evils it brings in its train but also by reason of the moral evil of which it is so signal an instance.

As already hinted, the traditional dogmatics has something more relevant to say in our modern world on the problem of the origin of moral evil or sin than it has on the problem of the origin of natural evil. But I do not think the writers in this series will spend much time on ultimate origins. It is on questions of immediate concern that they will concentrate.

Coming then to moral or ethical problems and difficulties, we are at once faced with issues on which Christian thinkers differ from each other as well as issues on which they unite. Take a subject like the Use of Force. Is the use of force, especially of force that leads to bloodshed, ever morally justified? Never, says the 'pacificist' (or 'pacifist'—a convenient phrase for the slovenly, but repellent to the purist!). But 'pacificism' has not at any time attained a firm and secure foothold in Christian doctrine. There is, however, general agreement that the aggressive use of force is contrary to Christian principle.

Or take a subject like Church and Nation, which is another suitable topic for this series. A time of war may put a strain on the national loyalty of Christian Churchmen, even when they are not radically opposed to war; they may want to be convinced of the righteousness of the national cause. But apart from that, there is room for difference of opinion on the place the Church should play in relation to that cause.

Other subjects of ethical bearing and import, arising out of the general subject of Church and Nation, may well fall to be considered in a topical light in this series; for example, Christian Loyalties and Christian Responsibilities.

There is one point, as it seems to me, on which Christian Churchmen in this land should be quite clear. It is that the cause of the nation is also that of the Church. In withstanding oppression and aggression in the name of justice, honour, and freedom, our nation is virtually withstanding an ethic which is consciously opposed to the Christian. I remember when I was in Marburg early in the century every second German student seemed to be avidly imbibing the works of that wayward genius Friedrich Nietzsche. It is difficult to estimate, but one may readily underestimate, the extent of his influence in precipitating the crisis of the Great War, with his doctrine which became so widely canvassed of the rightful dominance of the strong. That anti-Christian doctrine has been perpetuated in Germany, and in other parts of the European Continent, and has even been assuming aggravated forms. At the present juncture it inspires the policy of the rulers of Germany and Italy.

Which reminds me that the subject of Nationalism is on the programme of this series of articles, and fittingly so. Some would attribute the evils of our time to the national spirit, which they regard as the spirit of international anarchy. Certainly National Socialism and Fascism illustrate the moral blindness, to put it charitably, which the apotheosis of the national spirit may engender. Yet there is much that may be good and valuable in the national spirit.

But what the world most needs to-day is a revival of that universal principle of righteousness on which Amos and the Old Testament prophets insisted and which is endorsed in the teaching of Jesus. It is more than a merely human and social

principle. It is a divine principle, dynamic and inspiring. The cause of righteousness is the cause of the living God. He is not on the side of the big battalions, nor is He on the side of the small battalions; He is on the side of all those, wherever they are found, who are seeking to vindicate justice, honour, and freedom on the earth.

If we are to maintain a hopeful outlook upon human life, it would appear that we must view it as capable of transformation by righteousness from on high. It was of the genius of the 'First Humanism,' as the humanism of the Renaissance may be called, to part company with the transcendent and to lay all stress on the ideal of individual self-culture. In face, however, of the grave complexities of our modern world we are asked to subscribe to a more effective creed, the 'Second Humanism,' that socialistic or scientific philosophy which has social justice for its watchword. But from the prophetic standpoint of the Old and New Testaments the weakness of humanistic philosophies of life is that they dispense with the transcendent. They have no eyes for that Kingdom of God which Jesus preached, that City of God which John the Seer beheld, which cometh down from above. The result is we cannot discern in them any sure guarantee of hope for our troubled world. If there is to be any true hope of human progress on earth we must apparently make room in our thought for the idea of the God of righteousness as a dynamic, inspiring, and constructive factor in human effort and endeavour. We need prophets in our modern age to catch up the prophetic voices of the Bible and to bid us advance to a 'Third Humanism,' what M. Maritain calls an 'integral humanism,' in which the divine factor receives its due place; to a complete view of life, as we might put it, in which God and self and neighbour all have their parts. Then only shall justice run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.

The Historic Church and Present Need.

II. The City of God Remaineth.

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

The connexion between Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, and Augustine, Archbishop of Canterbury, may seem to be only casual. It is really causal. If, with the world falling in ruins about him, the first had not written his *De Civitate Dei* I doubt if our heathen ancestors would ever have seen the second. The Anglo-Saxons were among the most savage of those barbarians who fifteen hundred years ago invaded the Roman Empire and put out the light of Western civilization. A century and a half later (597) missionaries of the Roman Church were invading Kent, and rekindling the light of the Christian gospel. The second Augustine came because the first had believed, taught, and stamped it upon the minds of his successors that the kingdoms of this world may change but the City of God goes on a-building.

His faith was justified—or rather it so happened because he passed on such faith. The Church had at first been disliked and despised by the Empire, 'a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the vulgar.'[1] Later it had been adopted and used by the Empire, 'to set in order the body of the world, labouring under grievous sickness.'[2] Now it had outlasted the Empire. Soon it was to reclaim lands lost to the Empire—lands towards which there was no more in the West any imperial power to stretch out its hands. The Church was to become more central in the life of the new Europe than it could ever have been in that of the old Empire.

This last stage, subject of Augustine's prophetic vision, is often described with a different emphasis. The prophet who writes before the event understands better than the historian who comes after:

> 'In the rise of the Papacy on the spot left desolate by the Empire the mysterious power of the old city claimed the future as her own by breathing her stern spirit of aggression into the power of love and brotherhood which had begun to bind the world into a vaster system than even the Roman Empire had created.'[3]

[1] Tacitus, *Annales*, xv. 44.

[2] One of the descriptions by Constantine of the use he hoped to make of the Church.

[3] Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, 6.

This is a noble sentence, rightly acknowledging the magnitude of the Church's missionary achievement, begun under such Bishops of Rome as Gregory the Great. It is spoiled by that reference to the old city. 'The mysterious power' was the power of the City of God. Before the fall of Rome in 410, there had already been evident a transference of loyalty from the city as the capital of an earthly empire, to the city as the focal point on earth of the eternal Kingdom :

> 'It is for this that I admire the city (of Rome), not for its much gold, for its columns, nor for any other phantasy, but because of these two Pillars of the Church (Sts. Peter and Paul). Who will grant me to embrace the body of Paul, to cling to his sepulchre, to see the dust of that body which "filled up that which was lacking" in Christ, which bore His stigmata, and sowed His teaching everywhere.' [1]

After 410 what mysterious power remained about the city of Rome but that of Holy Church? It was the sense of that power, and of its continuing though the world lay in ruins, which Augustine handed on.

The quotation from Chrysostom conveniently raises a question which in any case could not long be kept back. At the end of the previous article I too quoted a passage about filling up what was lacking, that daring description of the Church in Eph $1^{22f.}$. Our accustomed English is a mistranslation dating back to Tyndale. It should read :

> 'The Church which is His body, the fulfilment of Him who is being out-and-out fulfilled.' [2]

I quote this passage to express the superlative worth of that which, beyond nation and culture and empire, and beyond all lesser idealisms, still claims our ultimate allegiance. It will inevitably be asked, Is not that to over-emphasize the Church as a visible institution?

Our Protestant way has been to accept such lofty expositions as applying to the Church triumphant. Our forefathers were compelled to challenge the authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and their sons have never recovered from it. Some have even grown accustomed to speaking lightly of the Church militant, as 'organized religion.' Surely the whole meaning of the Church as His body is that it is in some sense His second incarnation. He has no hands to do His will, no feet to walk His way, no voice to call men, apart from the *ecclesia*. The Church, doing these services for Him, does them imperfectly : anon there is a Judas who betrays, a Peter who denies, others who forsake Him and flee. Such is still the price of His humiliation. The Church is becoming, not has become. But its completion as the instrument of His purposes, or rather His fulfilment in the Church, is not left in doubt. Christ is being 'out-and-out fulfilled.' For the sake of Him whose body it shall perfectly become, we serve that which is becoming.

To those who believe distantly in the Church as the totality of the elect, and meanwhile consider their more immediate duty the spread of His Kingdom in the world—the leaven of Christian ideals, a more Christian social order, peace, and a Christian atmosphere for international relations—I would say two things : First, a transcendent Church ideal has no meaning unless it is related to that which persists among us. Second, we mistake our heritage—a disembodied Christianity never would have persisted. These causes which we serve and call His Kingdom would not be there at all but for the central fact of the Church, even the Church on earth with all its shortcomings. At this time when so many of our more diffused idealisms have come to disillusion, we are recalled to the central fact. We need to know that it is the Church for which we must live ; that the Church has that whereby the world itself must live ; and that in a ruined world the City of God remaineth.

Such is the faith of Augustine :

> 'This heavenly City then, while it sojourns on earth, calls citizens out of all nations, and gathers together a society of pilgrims of all languages, not scrupling about diversities in their manners, laws, institutions. . . . It even preserves and adopts these diversities so long as no hindrance to the worship of the one supreme God is thereby introduced. This alone can be truly called . . . peace . . . the perfectly ordered and harmonious enjoyment of God, and enjoyment of one another in God. In its pilgrim state the heavenly City possesses this peace by faith ; and by this faith it lives righteously . . . for the life of the City is a social life.' [3]

There is a surprisingly Augustinian strain in the call which was sounded from Madras.[4] I will quote one paragraph where you will find in other

[1] Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles to the Romans*, xxxii. St. John Chrysostom died three years before the fall of Rome.

[2] Cf. J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 42–45, 152.

[3] *De Civitate Dei*, bk. xix. 17.

[4] The meeting of the International Missionary Council at Tambaram, Madras, Dec. 12–29, 1938.

words the same three points made by Augustine above: (1) The Church is a world-wide Church; (2) the Church has the secret of true peace; (3) the life of the Church is the actualization of the Christian's faith for society:

> 'In all humility and penitence we are constrained to declare to a baffled and needy world that the Christian Church, under God, is its greatest hope. The decade since last we met has witnessed the progressive rending of the fabric of humanity; it has witnessed an increasing unification of the body of Christ. As we meet here from over sixty nations out of every continent we have discovered afresh that that unity is not merely an aspiration but a fact. . . . Our nations are at war with one another; but we know ourselves brethren in the community of Christ's Church. Our peoples increase in suspicion and fear of one another; but we are learning to trust each other more deeply through common devotion to the one Lord of us all. Our governments build instruments of mutual destruction; we join in united action for the reconciliation of humanity. Thus in broken and imperfect fashion the Church is even now fulfilling its calling to be within itself a foretaste of the redeemed family of God which He has purposed humanity to be. . . . By faith, but in deep assurance, we declare that this body which God has fashioned through Christ cannot be destroyed.'[1]

The City of God remaineth! Is it true? We saw that Augustine's faith was rewarded. What right have we to expect that ours will be? Let us look at it point by point.

(1) *The Church is a world-wide Church.* Just before going to that World Conference at Madras, I met an ex-India missionary in a London street. He knew me as ex-China, and said, 'We'll show you something of real missionary work now! We've got the biggest thing in the world, the outcaste movement.' In no business is it wise to let a competitor crack up his wares and get away with it. So I said, 'The biggest thing in the world? Perhaps you mean the most spectacular.' He leaned nearer to me and said, 'It is the answer to much that is happening on this side of the world.' And he was gone. For a moment I forgot the London street; I forgot the city of London; and I remembered the City of God. Now that I have seen with my own eyes, I shall never forget.

Something is happening on a scale which it is hard to parallel. 'A great door and effectual is opened.'[2] No, that is no longer the picture. The Church has had to put a foot against the door lest it should be stampeded. Even so, outcastes are coming in at the rate of three thousand a week, and there are seventy millions of them:

> 'If it has mattered to the whole world that seventy million people in Russia twenty years ago set their faces towards Marxism, how much will it matter if about the same number in India now ask us to show them the Christian way of life?'[3]

What one received on going to Madras was not only, nor mainly, some knowledge of Indian situations, but glimpses of the world Church over against world need. I have been trying to frame statements about other parts of the world which might stand with that just quoted. Here are two of my attempts, which I submit are just as startling, and just as true:

> If it matters to the world that some two hundred and fifty millions in Europe live under the domination of the Nazi clique, who persecute the Church and encourage paganism to rear again its ugly head, how much will it matter that four hundred and fifty millions in China should be finding unity to meet their crisis in the leadership of a Christian and should remain loyal to his government though temporarily invaded?[4]

> If we almost lose hope when we see the dark ages outclassed in the widespread savagery of anti-Jewish pogroms, what hope do we take when we remember that of the only race which has been still more vilely wronged, the Negro, seven per cent. have now been claimed as brothers in Christ?[5]

So one might go on. Link your lonely disillusioned individual strivings to the great task of the world Church, and you will see already in fact what Augustine could see only with the eye of faith, the Church as the centre of a new Christendom which is being built up to help to redress the balance of the old. The City of God remaineth.

[1] *The World Mission of the Church*, 19; *The Authority of the Faith*, Tambaram Madras Series, vol. i. 192 f. It needs no expert literary critic to recognize the composite nature of this document. Another strain keeps recurring which seems suspicious of this emphasis on the Church, and seeks to modify it with that which I have called diffused idealism concerning the Kingdom.

[2] 1 Co 16^9.

[3] G. E. Phillips, *The Untouchables' Quest*, 9.

[4] Figures from *Statistical Year Book of the League of Nations*, 1938–39, tables on pages 16 and 18.

[5] *Interpretative Statistical Survey of the World Mission*. 240.

(2) *The Church has the secret of true peace.* The above section may seem to advocate a mere geographic transfer of attention, from lands of despair to areas of hope. What we need is more than that; it is (to borrow a phrase used as a title for the popular account of the Madras Conference) 'Through Tragedy to Triumph,'[1] a faith which, like Augustine's, not only sees over the ruins but rises in their very midst. We need seek no further than our own Foreign Minister:

> 'To ignore the obligations of fellowship with those younger churches . . . would be at once failure and betrayal. For it would mean loss of hope and inspiration won through a common life in which peoples of all races may be united. We should surely be playing truant from a school where we can best learn many of the secrets essential to the building of the better world of our desires.'[2]

Reading those words one hears the voice, not of the statesman of a nation engaged in total war, but of a son of the Church and a servant of the City of God.

'Peoples of all races may be united . . .' I was privileged to see the following letter from a missionary in North China, where the tide of war has swept over, and (so it seemed at first), almost engulfed the Church:

> 'I cannot close this letter without a tribute to the attitude of Chinese Christians towards the people of Japan, especially towards Christians there. They pray for them as they do for the Church in China, and really feel that their union in Christ is stronger than all that separates. This is especially noticeable when a Japanese Christian soldier comes to church. We are living in the midst of an armed camp and from time to time do have such a visitor. The expression of strain and apprehension on seeing him vanishes as he says, "I also am a Christian." Last Sunday one came, in his own country a teacher of a Sunday-school class, now conscripted as a private in the transportation corps. One of our young teachers when she heard who and what he was, said "What a pity! What a waste!" The Japanese soldier had a talk with the Chinese minister. On leaving, since he was about to go to the front, he asked for a verse from the Chinese Bible, with the minister's signature, to carry in his cap. The verse the Chinese minister gave him was, "Where there cannot be Greek and Jew, . . . barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all."'[3]

As I folded the letter, I said, 'The City of God remaineth.'

'. . . The building of the better world of our desires.' One Englishman, with no previous experience of Chinese people, on returning from the Madras Conference said that the most impressive of all the national delegations was the forty or so members from China. 'Here in the West,' he explained, 'people are saying that the next war, if it comes, will be the end. In China it has come. But these Chinese Christian leaders do not speak of it as the end. They regard the ruin of their national life as their opportunity to rebuild it more nearly according to the mind of Christ.' That is not typical Chinese courage. There is no such thing. Courage has never been much of a virtue—in China no one is ashamed of saying that he is afraid. It is Christian courage, and it is true to type: 'This is the victory that overcometh the world even our faith.'[4]

(3) *The life of the Church is the actualization of the Christian faith for society.* By round-about ways the first news, since the Nazi invasion of the Low Countries, has just been received of a distinguished European delegate to Madras. In the letter comes this cryptic sentence which no Nazi censor would understand: 'How splendid that God gave us December 1938[5] before May 1940.'

There is a widespread tendency to indulge in self-pity. Twice in one lifetime we have seen the breakdown of Western civilization in ghastly war. Was ever a generation like ours? This attitude is, again, the result of fixing our attention on 'civilization,' on Christendom, on the vaguer idealisms which gather round the Church, and the diffused influences which radiate from it, instead of knowing that that which matters supremely is the central fact, the life of the Church itself. We see May 1940; many of us have never heard of December 1938.

As we gathered at Madras, representatives of Christ's Church from almost every land under the sun,[6] some of us thought we heard our Lord saying, 'Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not.'[7] Yes, indeed, was ever a genera-

[1] By Basil Mathews.

[2] Lord Halifax, letter to *The Times*, Nov. 26, 1939.

[3] Col 3^{11}.

[4] 1 Jn 5^{4}.

[5] The date of the Madras meeting.

[6] For list of members, see *Addresses and Other Records*, Tambaram Madras Series, vol. vii. 181–202.

[7] Lk 10^{23f}.

tion like ours? The universal nature of the Church, true as an ideal from the time of our Lord and His Apostles, we saw as no Christians in nineteen centuries have seen, worthily represented in the actual and the concrete. This also has happened in our lifetime. God is not mocked. The world is not left at the mercy of a madman. Present in God's world, and never so widely established, is God's Church, the central point of His working, the instrument for the fulfilment of His purposes, already in itself 'a foretaste of the redeemed family of God which He has purposed humanity to be.' The City of God remaineth. Lift up your hearts!

Literature.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Handbook to the Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching—Senior Section 11+ to 15+, by Mr. Basil A. Yeaxlee, Ph.D. (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net).

Principles of Teaching for Christian Teachers, by Mr. C. B. Eavey, Ph.D. (Zondervan Publishing House; $2.75).

Nurseries of Christians: A Call for Christian Schools, by Mr. John W. Skinner, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 1s. net).

Dr. Yeaxlee's book is something of an event. It will be an immense boon not only to those who teach according to the Cambridgeshire Syllabus, but to teachers everywhere. No one better fitted for the task could be selected. Dr. Yeaxlee is a scholar in every way equipped to direct and instruct those charged with the high trust of religious education. His mastery of the literature that throws light on the Bible is everywhere apparent in this book. It is so sure, so easy, so helpful that it will make those who gladly accept his guidance feel very humble indeed!

This is a background book. It is neither a commentary nor a series of notes on method. It provides under each section of the Bible to be studied information which the teacher should possess even if he does not use it all. The principle is in the main a sound one, for a teacher's background is the most important thing in his equipment. That is true in the broad sense of his culture. It is true also for the teaching of any particular lesson. But Dr. Yeaxlee is, I think, somewhat optimistic in suggesting that with the background furnished here a teacher will be able to apply the general knowledge of method he has been given to Bible teaching. Experienced teachers have been known (not seldom) to defend themselves for neglect of the Bible lesson on the ground that they were not taught how to do it. However, it was impossible to give both the background material *and* lessons on method of teaching Scripture in this volume, and what we get here is very enriching and better in itself than any mere lesson instruction.

Another conspicuous merit of this book is its insistence on the principle that the teaching of the Bible in school is not the teaching of 'Bible facts' only, by which is meant the historical facts, but the truth in the facts. Bible facts are the events plus their meaning. Religious instruction in schools is the teaching of religion, not of history or geography. The Bible historian did not set out to write the history of Israel. His purpose was to write the story of God's revelation of Himself through this history. And the teacher's business is to convey the meaning and purpose of the Bible writer to his pupils.

These are Dr. Yeaxlee's guiding principles. It would be difficult to exaggerate the competence with which they are carried out. The book covers practically the whole of Scripture, and the material is meant to meet the needs of senior classes. And at every point and on every subject it gives adequate assistance to the teacher. Here and there I find myself in mild disagreement with the author's judgments. But not on any main matter. I commend Dr. Yeaxlee's book to all teachers who would fit themselves for the great task and opportunity of religious education.

Dr. Eavey is head of the Department of Education and Psychology in Wheaton College, Illinois, and has produced his book under the auspices of the Evangelical Teacher Training Association of America. His aim has been to present a view of teaching that is in harmony with the Evangelical point of view, and at the same time to express 'in terms of spiritual and Biblical emphasis' the best

that modern psychology and education have to offer on the subject of teaching and learning. More than half the book before me is taken up with discourses on what teaching is and what a Christian teacher is and what learning implies. Much of this is sensible, a good deal long-winded; and I am afraid that the (presumably) docile reader will get a little wearied of generalities before he reaches the chapters on how to teach. These are quite good, by far the best in the book, and would be valuable as a small handbook if published separately. One could wish that American books on religious education were a little less eloquent, but on the whole the Evangelical Teacher Training Association has been well served by Dr. Eavey's contribution.

I wish Dr. John Skinner's little book could be circulated in every school and every home in the country. It is the ninth of the 'Pilot Book' series, to which we have already had two excellent contributions by Dr. Humphrey and Mr. Conrad Skinner. I read them both with satisfaction, but Dr. John Skinner's with even more wholehearted agreement and pleasure. It is a plea, first of all, for really Christian schools and for making the religious element primary in the school life. And, secondly, it is an appeal to the Church to put the religious training of its young people in the very foreground of its aims and activities. What Dr. Skinner says about sinking differences on things that are after all not essential and setting about the thing that is urgent is admirable and clamantly needed. I am glad to see that a paper-bound edition of this book is available at 4d. net.

F. J. Rae.

ILICO ON EVERYTHING.

No More Apologies, by Ilico (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). The identity of Ilico is a dark secret shared by about a hundred thousand people (I hope I am not too optimistic about the number). But *what* Ilico may be is, I am sure, a much more intimate matter. I admit I cannot penetrate its mystery. Whatever the answer, whether the word is Latin or Greek or Italian, or merely an inversion of letters which a crossword expert would detect in a trice, we are very grateful for his book. I confess I turned at once to page 117 which begins the third section, 'A Miscellany but still mainly about Religion.' My choice was justified. Ilico has rediscovered the essay. It is not too high praise to say that these papers carry the mind back to Addison's 'Spectator,' Lamb, and Hazlitt. We all remember the delight with which we steeped ourselves in these delicious trifles. Well, I have found much the same pleasure in Ilico's reflections on Feeding the Chickens, on Furnishing a Study (the item of greatest importance is the waste-paper basket), on a Policeman's Lot, on Reading the Newspaper (in which he flies to heights where few could follow him), on Praise of Sherlock Holmes, and other matters. It is difficult to describe the essay, its inconsequence, its easy, supple prose, its glancing humour, its whimsicality. It is how one would like to talk, with a certain seriousness not far off, 'still mainly about religion.' This is the part of the book I liked best.

But there are other parts. The one that contains the main burden of the book is headed 'Mainly about the Christian Faith.' And the main burden is frank, definite, Catholic orthodoxy. Ilico has a certain amount to say about the sermons he sometimes hears. He is distressed by their indefiniteness about the fundamental Christian facts. About the Resurrection of our Lord, for example. He finds it represented in some such fashion as this. The Apostles' faith had been shattered; and then 'something happened'; they became 'somehow convinced' that their Master was not dead but was still with them, and in this confidence went forward to conquer the world. Ilico's comment is: 'Could anything be more improbable and unconvincing? . . . Are we presented with a psychological change in the minds of the disciples or with a mighty act of God? That is the issue.' Similarly, 'without miracle there is no religion, or, at least there is no Christianity.' Miracle is 'the whole question of the relation of God to the universe of which He is Creator.' The Incarnation, the Holy Trinity, the Atonement—the 'whole Gospel,' is presented to us as the hand of God stretched out to us in grace. And not so much as a theology. The power of this book is that the grace of God is exalted by a witness who openly rejoices in it and in its manifestations in Christ. 'No more apologies,' he says; no more whittling down the Faith, none of your feeble rationalizings that give up the very thing the gospel stands for. The positive, assured faith of this writer, stated so warmly, so convincingly, so experimentally, will bring light and comfort to many.

The power of the book lies, I repeat, in its witness and its challenge. I am not so sure of Ilico when he *defends* a doctrine. His discussion of Providence and Prayer on pp. 89–93 is not so convincing. And his defence of Justification by Faith on pp. 249–254 is perplexing, since he seems to be willing to substitute 'love' for faith, as though we are justified

by something in ourselves and not solely by the grace of God. However, it should be remembered that these are brief 'papers,' liable to be misunderstood if taken as systematic discussions. Ilico will both charm and reassure many by this acceptable book, which, whatever the theme, is 'mainly about religion.' F. J. Rae.

JOHN FOXE.

John Foxe and His Book, by the Rev. J. F. Mozley, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). Mr. Mozley is an enthusiastic defender of John Foxe, so enthusiastic indeed that he might be accused of partisanship were it not that he supports his case for the most part by incontrovertible evidence. We wish that his style were less pompous and that he had a greater sense of humour; also that he had arranged his material differently and achieved a closer unity of design. He divides his book into two almost exactly equal sections. In the first he deals with the life of John Foxe, and gives a clear picture of the man in the vicissitudes of his career and his tenacity of purpose. Foxe was without personal ambition, willing to sacrifice in more fortunate days his hopes of preferment in order to secure his own freedom in minor matters, almost the despair of his friends in his disregard of anything which might contribute to his outward prosperity — always impecunious and always generous. He had an intensely spiritual nature— 'what is bodily death if the soul be alive' indicates a courageous attitude suited to the troublous times in which he lived. But along with this resoluteness went a hatred of cruelty; he was, for example, in advance of his times in his constant protests against capital punishment. He had a genius for friendship, and showed tenderness and insight in his treatment of the morbid fears of those who consulted him. He seemed to be able to inspire confidence to such an extent that, without greatly desiring this, he acquired a considerable reputation for faith-healing! The second part of the book deals with the martyrology itself, including an account of the various editions, both in Latin and in English, which preceded the colossal work associated with Foxe's name. In several lengthy chapters Mr. Mozley deals with the attacks frequently made on Foxe's good faith and historical accuracy, and, on the whole, is successful in vindicating him against charges of credulity and unfairness. If occasional violence of expression is noticeable in him, it must be remembered that the Protestants of Foxe's day had but recently emerged from a period of intense persecution, and the stability of the new regime was by no means assured, depending as it did on the slender thread of the Queen's life. Mr. Mozley's considered judgment is that 'despite hurry and inaccuracies, Foxe gives us a solid mass of historical facts.' It is noteworthy that Mr. H. A. L. Fisher comes to an almost exactly similar conclusion.

W. S. Urquhart.

ARCHBISHOP PARKER.

Under Four Tudors, by Mrs. Edith Weir Perry (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), is claimed in the sub-title to be 'the true story of Matthew Parker and Margaret.' To many the sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, who lived through the four reigns of Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, and was the first Anglican occupant of the See of Canterbury, is almost unknown; but for those who have inherited the tradition of the Church of England he is a vital link in the development of that Church, and this book, well written and carefully documented, will enable them to appreciate still more fully their heritage. The style is occasionally somewhat pedantic, but we get a clear picture of the safeguarding Archbishop of a transition period, and the work has obviously been a labour of love. The writing of the book was suggested by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, and he contributes a Foreword, in which he speaks of Parker having played a most important part in the long history of the English Church, and expresses surprise at the comparative neglect into which he has fallen. Parker was not a genius or even a man of exceptional ability, and was more suited temperamentally for an academic life than for the conduct of public affairs. But, when, very reluctantly, he accepted appointment as Elizabeth's first Archbishop, he did his duty nobly according to his lights. He 'held the pass,' and defended the Church of England against the ultra-Protestants, who would have despoiled her of dignity, and against the entrenched might of the Roman Church which would have brought her again, abjectly, under Papal despotism. Parker thus incurred the hatred of two opposing factions, and this partly explains the almost insuperable difficulties with which he struggled. His reputation, also, was overshadowed, according to Mrs. Perry, by two predecessors— the spectacular Wolsey and the literary Cranmer, 'whose genius burns with steady flame through the pages of the Book of Common Prayer'—as well as by Cecil's dominance in Elizabethan policy.

The title of the book hints at the see-saw vicissitudes of Parker's life—his moderate academic prosperity under Henry VIII., his greater liberty under Edward, his sufferings and dangers under Mary, and his prominent but difficult position under Elizabeth. Incidentally Mrs. Perry gives an altogether excellent account of the relation of Henry to the incipient Church of England.

The words 'and Margaret' in the sub-title are significant. Mrs. Perry has been greatly attracted by the personality and gifts of the first lady of Lambeth Palace. It was not easy for a married archbishop to establish the position of his wife, and the pioneer had much to endure—after the beginning of their romance seven years of patient waiting until the death of Henry made their marriage possible, an interval of quiet happiness in academic circles under Edward, then again poverty and persecution under Mary, and a grudging recognition from Elizabeth, who disapproved of the marriage of the clergy and detested that of an archbishop, but had to submit to a *fait accompli* and preferred Parker with a wife to no Parker at all. In revenge the Queen made Mrs. Parker's life a hard one, and the way in which the latter triumphantly vindicated her position, and steadfastly supported her husband in both his public and his private life, explains and justifies Mrs. Perry's unstinted and enthusiastic admiration.

W. S. URQUHART.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND.

The fourth and final volume of Dr. W. K. Jordan's monumental and scholarly work on *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* is now before the public (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). It is complementary to the third volume, dealing with the same period (1640–1660). While the third volume examined toleration as a political issue this deals mainly with the development of lay thought and the gradual transformation wrought by adversity upon religious Communions. We have illuminating treatment of the part played by Latitudinarians and Moderates, the Cambridge Platonists, the Rationalists, the Erastians, and the rank and file; then the movement towards toleration in the Anglican and the Roman Churches. The problem was to make a religious principle of toleration and it came only gradually to find a value in bodies who had conceived toleration to be a sin. Dr. Jordan has performed his task with marked success and great ability and those volumes of his are a considerable enrichment of English theological literature.

W. D. NIVEN.

The Case against Pacifism, by Dr. John Lewis (Allen & Unwin; 2s. net), is a vigorous piece of writing. It contains quite an armoury of weapons for use in this hot controversy. The one obvious defect in the book, though the writer will be far from thinking so, is that he has mixed up so much party politics with the discussion of this difficult moral problem. He is an out-and-out supporter of Russia even in her actions towards Finland and Poland; he believes the governments of Baldwin and Chamberlain to have been pro-Fascist; and he accuses the Church of being 'militant in an imperialist war and pacifist in a war for true liberty.' In spite of these partisan judgments and unworthy suspicions the writer in dealing with his main subject argues with clearness, shows himself well informed, and treats his opponent's case in a thorough and comprehensive way.

We have already noticed and welcomed the appearance of the first two volumes of the work entitled *The Church and the World* (Allen & Unwin), which consists of materials for the historical study of Christian Sociology. The authors are Canon Cyril E. Hudson, M.A., and Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt, M.A., and the latter has written the third and concluding volume which has recently appeared. The scope of the volume appears in the sub-title, *Church and Society in England from 1800*. The cost is 7s. 6d. net.

In reaching the nineteenth century a narrowing of scope was inevitable if the work were to be completed in a third volume. Only the situation as it developed in this country is here considered (and the *terminus ad quem* must be taken to be the outbreak of war in September 1939). Even so, there are many varied movements to be noted and commented upon in this companion to studies, and many authors of varying views to be named and quoted. The result is a useful guide to the contemporary situation.

Among the contemporary movements in the study of which guidance is also offered is the transition from Liberal Humanism to a theocentric position, as also from Christian Ethics to Christian Sociology; while emphatic testimony is given to the need for a Christian resistance to the Totalitarian State. There are also useful Appendices on Christian Missions and Christian Education.

Born of Welsh parents in Scotland and receiving his early education in England, Edwin Ewart Aubrey has been for some time Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics in the University of Chicago. He has written a good deal, and his qualities are attested by the fact that one of his books, 'Religion and the Next Generation,' was adopted by the Religious Book Club. We now have from his pen *Man's Search for Himself* (Cokesbury Press : $1.75). To what extent under present conditions it is available in this country, we do not know. It is a stimulating study of the problems of human personality—man an individual in the necessary framework of society, freedom and its limitations. Only as a member of the Kingdom of God will man find the solution. The Church must show the way towards the overcoming of many problems. If within its own borders, for example, it cannot surmount class-distinctions, if it exhibits the hard dominance of privilege and prejudice, how can it speak to the world with any authority? Yes, it is a searching book at more than one point and suggestive at all.

The Rev. R. Scott Frayn, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., has expanded and published the thesis for his doctorate —*Revelation and the Unconscious* (Epworth Press ; 10s. 6d. net). The work covers a wide as well as an important field in Dr. Frayn's treatment of it. He is obviously familiar with the literature of any topic he has occasion to handle and he has made a real contribution to the main subject. He is convinced, and will convince the reader, that the relations of psychology to theology are very intimate, and many who are perplexed what value to assign to writers like Jung and Freud will find real help. Revelation in the last resort is the impact of God upon individual personalities. Those leaders were not gifted with a 'sixth sense'; Dr. Frayn finds no need to postulate a 'supra-conscious.' They were individuals whose whole consciousness was 'integrated,' and the perfect revealer was Jesus Christ who was perfectly 'integrated.' Very interesting are the analyses of the rise and significance of prophets of old and modern forceful personalities.

The Best Word Ever, by the Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 2s. 6d. net) contains a series of ten sermons based on Jn 3^{16}. The preacher has a fertile mind and a warm heart. Apart from some ill-considered jibes at evolution and the higher criticism there is nothing in the book to take exception to. It is good old-fashioned gospel preaching delivered with passionate fervour and earnestness. Not every reader will care for the style but there are many, as the writer's successful ministry in Edinburgh witnesses, who will receive it with gladness and profit by it.

Many years ago Professor W. G. Blaikie wrote *A Manual of Bible History* which was popular and useful in his time. This has now been revised and brought up-to-date by the Rev. Charles D. Matthews, Ph.D., the American Orientalist. One feature of the new edition is the incorporation of the latest contributions of historical and archæological research. As will be guessed from its origin, the standpoint of the book is conservative. But it is a most useful type of book. It tells the Bible story, period by period, supplying such information as is necessary to make the narrative intelligible. It is the kind of thing done so well by Professor Foakes-Jackson in his 'Biblical History of the Hebrews.' Dr. Matthews' book is perhaps not on the same level as Dr. Foakes-Jackson's, but it is a thoroughly sound piece of work, and will be useful not only to general readers but especially to teachers. It is published by Messrs. Nelson & Sons and the price is 10s. 6d. net.

In 1933 Mr. Lars P. Qualben published his one-volume *History of the Christian Church*. A revised edition appeared in 1936 and a reprint of this has now come to our hands (Nelson ; 12s. 6d. net). It is in three parts, dealing respectively with the Ancient Period, the Mediæval World, and the Modern Period. The last is sub-divided into sections dealing with the 'Old World' and the 'New World.' Of one-volume Church histories it is one of the best, and is specially interesting and illuminating by reason of the numerous maps and diagrams supplied. Very useful, too, are the 'questions' set down for discussion at the end of each chapter.

Once more we bring to your notice Messrs. Pickering & Inglis' Golden Grain calendars. The *Daily Meditation* calendar (2s. net) reproduces a garden with a wealth of flowers in full bloom. The *Golden Text* calendar (1s. 6d. net) pictures 'The Path through the Bluebells.' *Daily Manna* and *Daily Grace* (1s. 3d. net each) have both pretty pictures, and the *Young Folks'* calendar, also 1s. 3d., has a charming study of 'The Little Nurse.' All the calendars have a tear-off block and text for each day of the year. The prices of the calendars are subject to the purchase tax.

The Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A., favourably known for his 'Lectures in Hyde Park,' has written a book, *A Church Genuinely Catholic* (S.P.C.K. ;

6s. net), which may surprise some of those who knew him as the Hyde Park lecturer. There is a historical section in which various forms of Catholicism are examined. This is followed by a section on 'The Nature of Catholicism,' which is based on the famous threefold test: *quod ubique, quod semper,* and *quod ab omnibus*. Mr. Rogers is a convinced 'Catholic,' and an emphatically attached Anglican, so that his claim for the Church of England may be easily surmised. Of the 'Continuous Church' which Christ founded he believes that the Anglican communion is the historical representative here in England. One is not prepared, however, at this time of day, for a summary dismissal of the right of any other body to the name 'Church.' 'If we are right in believing that Christ founded the Church, there are in this sense no such things as "the churches." If by courtesy we use the expression of other bodies, as we often do in ordinary conversation, we are using the word in what to us is a non-natural sense.' That is definite and final, and the courage that impels any one to say it openly is admirable. But in face of the great issues of to-day and the clamant call for the closing of our ranks and the sinking of non-essentials, is it not a melancholy phenomenon?

A brilliantly written book on the Christian Ethic comes from the Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in the University College of Hull, T. E. Jessop —*Law and Love* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The book is extraordinarily interesting, not only because of its contents but because of its arresting style. Professor Jessop is a master of phrases that jolt the mind and make one pause and savour their originality. The argument is radical. The author challenges not so much our Christian practice as our ordinary Christian ideals. These are, in the main, two: first, the moral life is set forth as unfaltering devotion to duty, the subjugation of desire to will; and second, the moral life is equated with the requisites of the social order. In other words our two ideals are Duty and Respectability. And neither is Christian. Of the latter this may be said to be obvious. But it is as true of the former. The ideal of duty is wrong because it is legalistic and egoistic. The ethic of duty leaves too much of actual, desirable, and inevitable living outside it. It takes a heavy toll of energy and happiness, neglects intelligence and leaves out charity.

Jesus did not criticise badness. He criticised goodness. His message was a declaration that the common moral distinction of goodness and badness is not *supremely* important, and that not until it has been transcended has the distinctively Christian level been reached. And this, of course, is love. To the exposition of this three chapters are devoted —on the generosity, the positivity (this horrid word is a lapse from the general fineness of the style), and the childlikeness of love. Naturally the author comes up against Pacifism, but this he rejects decisively, for reasons which seem sufficient to him.

Professor Jessop has written his book because it seems to him that we have got into a rut ethically. We have settled down with a traditional interpretation of the Christian Ethic. We are content with our ideals. These he challenges, and wishes us out of our rut. His book ought to be read, partly for its sheer interest and the pleasure this supple mind will give, and partly because it deals worthily with a great theme.

The Pre-Exilic Prophets and Pacifism.

By the Very Reverend J. S. MacArthur, B.D., M.A., The College, Millport.

In the pages of the Old Testament the chosen people of God are often represented as waging war with the approval and indeed sometimes at the bidding of Jehovah himself. In the earlier stages of their development Jehovah was thought of as the war-god of his people leading them to victory, so that the prosecution of war was regarded as a holy undertaking. When, however, Jehovah came to be regarded no longer as the war-god of a single people, with correspondingly limited power and jurisdiction, but as the creator and ruler of the universe, how did this approach to a fuller monotheism affect the attitude of his people to war?

It was largely through the teaching of the prophets that the early conception of Jehovah as a tribal god was transcended, and it is therefore

natural to look to their teaching for a corresponding change of ideas regarding war. Such a change must not be looked for too soon, for the prophetic movement at its early stages was militarist. Deborah was a prophetess, and she was certainly no pacifist. Neither were the bands of prophets who came into prominence about the time of the institution of the monarchy.

What of Samuel himself? In what is generally regarded as the earliest and most reliable account of him he is represented as acclaiming Saul who is to be the military saviour of the people of Jehovah from their foes. Saul is bidden to join himself to the prophetic bands and receives the whole-hearted support of Samuel in his exploit against the Ammonites at Jabesh-gilead.[1]

But there is another and probably later account of Samuel in which his attitude towards the monarchy is very different. There (1 S $8^{10ff.}$) he warns the people of what they must expect if they insist on having a king to rule over them, and among the burdens that they will have to bear is that of military service. There is here a distinct suggestion that war is the game of kings, and although such views cannot reasonably be attributed to Samuel himself, they probably represent the beliefs of a school of prophetic thought in the Northern Kingdom about the eighth century B.C. In the same stratum of the tradition there is a hint that Jehovah cannot be coerced into giving his people the victory in battle. Yet even the Samuel of the later narratives can hardly be regarded as a pacifist in view of his very bloodthirsty exhortation to Saul that he should utterly destroy Amalek and all that they had (1 S $15^{1ff.}$).

David was a warrior-king, and his warlike exploits are glorified throughout the descriptions of his campaigns. But it may be noted that David was a priests' man rather than a prophets' man. By his military prowess he captured Jerusalem and signalized his victory by bringing the ark of the covenant there and making it his capital, but the task of building a temple to house the ark was left to his son. According to a late tradition (1 Ch 22^{8}) it was because he was a man of war that he was not allowed to build a house of God, but in the earlier account (2 S 7) the prophet Nathan's opposition to the king's project of temple-building is based on the characteristic prophetic distrust of elaboration of worship rather than on the idea that David had incurred blood-guiltiness.

It is in the period of the divided monarchy that we can see certain of the prophets more or less explicitly disapproving of military aggrandizement. That is not to say that the prophetic movement, previously nationalist and militarist, now becomes pacifist. Militarist and nationalist prophetism continued to exist, but we can trace the emergence of notable figures sufficiently conformed to the prophetic type to be known as prophets, but speaking and acting with great independence of, and sometimes even in opposition to, the mass of those who claimed prophetic inspiration.

Shortly after the secession of the Northern Kingdom Rehoboam assembled an army at Jerusalem in order to recover the North for the house of David, but was dissuaded by the prophet Shemaiah who did not utter a general denunciation of war but condemned this particular military enterprise which he regarded as civil war. 'Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren,' was his message (1 K 12^{24}).

Elijah, the greatest of the predecessors of the writing prophets, lived during the reign of Ahab. Ahab was a great soldier, but in the record of Elijah's ministry his military campaigns are passed over in silence. From this silence it would be rash to deduce the prophet's attitude to war, but he preserved a notable detachment in his relations with the prophetic party of his time (1 K $18^{7ff.}$).

Ahab's treatment of the prophets of Jehovah was not calculated to win him their support in time of war, but we find him receiving prophetic assistance in one of his campaigns against Syria (1 K 20^{28}). In the same campaign another anonymous prophet rebuked him for insufficient ruthlessness in warfare. On the other hand, immediately before the battle in which Ahab met his death, we find a sharp opposition between the militarist prophets who encouraged Ahab and his ally the king of Judah to recover Ramoth-gilead from Syrian hands and the solitary figure of Micaiah ben Imlah who, after some hesitation, tried to dissuade the allies from an enterprise which he foresaw would be disastrous. Here again there is no outright condemnation of war, but one more instance of prophetic discouragement of military aggrandizement.

Elisha asked that a double portion of the spirit of Elijah might be upon him, but he came far short of the spiritual stature of his master. His connexion with the professional prophets was much closer, and he was much more politically-minded. One

[1] Cf. 1 S 9^{11} and note especially the LXX addition to 1 S 10^{1}: 'anointed thee *to be prince over his people Israel? And thou shalt have authority over the people of the Lord and shalt save them out of the hands of their enemies, and this shall be to thee the sign that the Lord hath anointed thee* to be prince over his inheritance.'

consequence of this was that he did not preserve the same detachment from his military undertakings of his country as his great predecessor had done. After a half-hearted attempt to leave such matters alone (2 K 3^{13}) he gave his support to the joint campaign of Israel and Judah against Moab, and in the subsequent war against Syria he took an even more prominent part, and his leadership in the particularly savage revolution which established the Jehu dynasty shows us a prophet who was no more of a pacifist than Deborah herself.

Amos, the first of the great writing prophets, ministered soon after Jeroboam II. had extended the boundaries of the Northern Kingdom. In this enterprise the king had received prophetic support from Jonah, the son of Amittai (2 K 14^{25}), but Amos was not impressed by this military success, and did not see in it a token of the favour of Jehovah. For him Jehovah was no longer the war-god of Israel, but the ruler of the nations. He rebuked the folly of those who longed for the day of Jehovah, thinking of it as the day on which the war-god would lead his people to victory. It would be a day of darkness and not light. In the arraignment of the nations which stands at the beginning of his prophecy (Am 1–2) frightfulness in warfare is prominent among the transgressions for which the wrath of Jehovah is impending, and it is denounced, not from the point of view of Israelite interests, but from that of universal morality. The prophet does not explicitly condemn war, but he divests it of its glamour, and he is careful to dissociate himself from the professional prophets who might have been suspected of engineering a revolution (Am $7^{14ff.}$).

Hosea has little to say about war. He does not in so many words draw the obvious conclusion from the central theme of his message, that war is an offence against the lovingkindness which Jehovah shows to and demands of his people. Of the civil war which established the house of Judah he has no good to say (Hos 1^{4}), and he is no less opposed to military alliances with foreign nations.

The same discouragement of foreign alliances is seen in the prophecies of Isaiah. He encouraged Ahaz to abstain from the Syro-Ephraimitic alliance against Assyria and discouraged him from seeking a counter-alliance with Assyria, but once that alliance had been made there should be no attempts to repudiate it by seeking the support of other powers. Similarly, Hezekiah's reception of the envoys of Merodach-baladan, the rebel prince of Babylon, and his display of all his resources to them is condemned (Is 39). The invasion of Sennacherib should probably be placed after this episode rather than before it, and justified the prophet's rebuke to the king. Whether the nation could have preserved its independence by renouncing all military ambition and keeping clear of alliances with the great powers that were then disputing the domination of the world is doubtful, but it seems certain that the disasters which overtook the kingdom of Judah were at least hastened and aggravated by the ill-advised attempts of her leaders to fish in the troubled waters of foreign politics.

Without raising the question of the Isaianic authorship of such Messianic passages as Is 2^{2-4} 9^{1-6} 11^{1-9}, it may be noted that there is little glorification of war in any of them, and that peace is regarded as one of the greatest blessings of the Messianic age, a peace grounded in mutual understanding rather than in the military supremacy of the Messiah. The first of the above-mentioned passages with its parallel in Mic 4^{1-3} is only Messianic in a secondary sense, as looking forward to a golden age while making no mention of a Messianic ruler, but the renunciation of war is definite. God Himself is to judge between the nations, and the instrument of His judgment is unspecified. If that instrument is war then the prophet thinks it unnecessary to invest it with any glamour. But once the judgment is accomplished 'they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' [1]

The militaristic tone of Mic 4^{6}–5^{9} is not in itself an argument against the authenticity of the passage, but the idea of world empire (Mic 5^{4}) marks it as late. The short oracle (Mic 5^{10-15}) which concludes the chapter is more likely to be the work of the prophet himself, and if it is not a direct condemnation of war it at least expresses disapproval of the foreign methods of warfare, horses, and chariots, which were regarded as a mark of imperialist ambition.

The writings of Jeremiah are important as indicating the prophetic attitude towards war in face of the final military disaster which overthrew the kingdom of Judah. The prophet saw that military resistance would not avail to avert the doom that was impending, and in consequence gained a reputation for defeatism that nearly cost him his life.[2] Jeremiah's position was made the more difficult by the fact that the Scythian invasion which he had previously foretold had not taken place, but he could have pointed out with reason that the escape of Judah was not due to her military

[1] Is 2^{4}, Mic 4^{3}. [2] Jer $26^{10ff.}$.

prowess. Nevertheless the people were so much impressed by his greatness that they shielded him from the anger of the priests and false prophets. At a later stage (Jer 38) he counselled surrender and once more nearly lost his life.

In this brief survey it has not been possible even to glance at more than a very small fraction of the prophetic literature relevant to the ethics of war, but if we have been successful in our attempt to consider the most significant passages, the following conclusions may be drawn. The prophets who can be recognized as the spiritual leaders of their people were not preoccupied with personal ambition. This gave them a clarity of vision denied to their neighbours. It enabled them to see that with the disruption of the Hebrew kingdom any possibility of a Hebrew world empire had passed. Such territorial expansions as took place during the reign of Jeroboam II. were due to dissensions among their more powerful neighbours and could only be temporary. It was not by waging war that God's chosen people were to achieve greatness, and hence we find that the prophets without condemning war outright nevertheless discouraged military aggrandizement, and that their disapproval was based not so much on humanitarian motives as on the belief that the ambitions and the fears which drive nations to war are alike indicative of insufficient trust in God. Few of the prophets, one imagines, would have supported the Peace Pledge Union with its unconditional renunciation of war, but most of them would have approved of the Kellogg Pact with its renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, though their realism might have distrusted the unbacked promises of so many of its signatories.

A Comment on the Nativity and 'The Winter's Tale.'

By the Reverend P. Laurence K. Mudie.

Only when the New Testament is allied to bookland does it fully reveal its wealth. Tales such as the one before us belong to the noblest drama. They are best seen in their beauty when they are linked to the greatest pageants which art and letters can enshrine. Our purpose is to create the background of another great pastoral. *The Winter's Tale* opens to every lover of truth an inimitable story of the Child. It tells too of 'shepherds abiding in the field.' If we gain a glimpse of its tender loveliness we will enter with more intensity into the meaning of the companion picture of St. Luke.

In idyllic tales the discovery of the Child is a favourite theme. Both these stories—the Eastern and the Western—are woven round this immortal act. In his *Everyman's Life of Jesus*, Professor Moffatt quotes the lines—

> They were all looking for a king,
> To slay their foes and lift them high;
> Thou cam'st, a little baby thing
> That made a woman cry.

The creation of the Child by the artist or the writer is the recurrent note in both tales. Leontes, King of Sicily, has condemned his innocent queen, through an unworthy suspicion. Both stories have their tyrant monarch—Herod and Leontes. For here, as in the Evangel, sinister purposes of conduct stand as the vivid contrast to the promise of the coming of the Babe to earth. Her little offspring is sent over distant seas. By his master's sword Antigonus swears that he will leave her on foreign shores exposed—

> Take up the child
> . . . that there thou leave it,
> Without more mercy, to its own protection,
> And favour of the climate . . .
> That thou commend it strangely to some place,
> Where chance may nurse, or end it.
>
> Act II., iii. 175.

There is a storm; and in peril does the nurse reach Bohemia. Amid the tempest the babe is cast upon the bleak and cruel shore. A shepherd in the darkness has been looking for his stray sheep. Amidst the tempest, he almost stumbles upon the babe at his feet. 'Mercy on us,' he exclaims, 'a bairn, a very pretty bairn. I'll take it up for pity.' How near it brings us to the fields of Bethlehem! At the moment, little does this kindly man dream that he is touching one of regal birth. He makes it his office to shelter her. As a shepherdess she grows, unconscious of her lineage. Fittingly enough, the name that graces her loveliness is Perdita. Lin-

guistically, it stands for a maiden who has been lost. The Prince of Bohemia at the time is Florizel. When Perdita reaches gladsome girlhood he begins to love her. He, too, treats her as a country lass. Fearsome looks are cast on him by kinsfolk. The misgiving of the girl is that the king of the land should find his son in such company. Yet the Prince decides to make her his bride. This is to all appearance the fatal step. It is likely to alienate him from the favour of Polixenes, his father. It will bar him from the castle where he has been reared. Perdita has nothing to recommend her to the court. She has no royal seal to present. In that scene how readily to the ear come the melodious words of our old Scottish Paraphrase—

> In human likeness dwelt on earth,
> his majesty concealed.

Great is the rapture when it becomes known that the girl is no poor shepherdess. She is of royal blood. The Prince takes her across the seas to Sicily. There she is received with favour. The Sicilian king is reconciled. Forgiveness, peace, overflowing happiness are brought to earth. 'Such a deal of wonder is broken out within this hour that ballad-makers cannot express it.' Let us lay the records of the Nativity beside that fragrant *Winter's Tale* and we will be surprised to discover traits that shall wed them forever in our thought.

A suggestive parallel in the Play and the Nativity Tale is that in each the prelude to the dénouement is a period of evil and disorder. Leontes in a most unaccountable way makes havoc of the life of his dearest. Yet the coming of a new world is not made impossible by his sin. Reconciliation is the sequence to tumult in his own soul in the life of others, and in the storm and loss at sea. Jesus comes not to a world that welcomes Him and is ready for the reign of righteousness but to an earth in which error has run riot. The darkness precedes the dawn. Professor Herford has aptly pointed out 'that the Fifth Act of *Winter's Tale* is in Sicily and that everything in it is subordinated to the great recognition scene at the close.' Masefield writes with a similar insight —'It ends with an easing of the strain, and the making of peace.'

Daffodils come before the swallow dares, and touch the winds of March with beauty. We think of Perdita amongst her flowers and Jesus amongst the lilies. When we dwell on the Κένωσις, there is a fineness in the threading of the narrative which yields a peculiar aptness to any allusion that Scripture makes to our Christian inheritance. Perdita's recovery was demanded ere the heir to the throne should take his place. Is it straining our New Testament records overmuch to stress how inseparable is the bestowal of the Christ-child to the world in order that man might reach his heritage? Is not this the inwardness of the Pauline phrase—Κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ συνκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ.

In both themes, too, regal worth is revealed in the Child as an answer to toil. The shepherd on the Bohemian coast (as on the fields of Bethlehem) does the thing that is nearest to him. He tends his flock. He looks for those that go astray. It is thus that the vision comes. It is then that the Palace Beautiful opens its gates. In these days especially of national peril many people complain that God is undiscovered. They can gauge no regal movement in the world around them that draws Him to their side. Certain truths are forgotten—God is found by the discerning eye, and by the serviceable life. The kindly figure on the Bohemian coast opens his arms to the friendless babe. Unknown to him a princess is his prize! The herdsmen in Eastern lands obey the immediate impulse in their hearts. They go to find the infant in the manger. The discovery of Him is in one sense a gift unspeakable. In another, it is the response to their eagerness and love.

> Feeding their sheep, they found the Shepherd Good,
> Who gave His life a ransom for the sheep;
> The Shepherd who in love His scattered flock
> Came down from Heaven to gather and to keep.

Godhead is not easily recognized. 'Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself.' He may be before us every day and lie disguised, as was the royalty of Perdita from the rough shepherd. When we do something to bring Him to us—when we put out a hand of chivalry, or of ministering succour, we see into the heart of things. The divine gleams upon the way of life. Virgil records how the eyes of Æneas were holden on the way. He failed to realize the presence of the goddess although he passed her in the wood. He mistook her for a country woman with no qualities celestial. In her walk something more than human reveals itself. The disdain of Æneas is changed to reverence. The little child on Bohemian shores, as she grows, prattles and dances, lives an ordinary life of gladness. She is accepted for her own goodness as a friend. She is housed and made welcome. She begins to walk the roads amidst the flowers with some reminder of the stock from which she has sprung. Inevitably, she witnesses her contact with the throne. It shines through her radiant eyes and in her winning ways. Not in some stately temple do the shepherds find the pearl of

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

great price—the surpassing beauty of the child Jesus. Through His babyhood, and youth, His Deity is undiscerned. Worship becomes the only fitting way to approach Him. To use a beauteous phrase of Sir John Beaumont, 'His cradle becomes His altar.' In wonder, love, and praise men fall before Him and call Him Lord.

Again, we find a golden link between the Nativity and *Winter's Tale*. It is this, that in both the seeming lack of lustre becomes a means of grace. Μυστήριον becomes ἀποκάλυψις. 'The news that is called true is so like an old tale that the verity of it is in strong suspicion.' Some one once defined Revelation as the self-unveiling of God in history. If this be so then we must be here on the right pathway to that marvellous miracle. It is the mystery of Godliness—God manifest in the flesh. The lowliness of the appearance, the likeness of the common life deceive us. There is an inimitable note in one edition of the Play. It tells that in Elizabethan days a tale was in vogue that gave the dramatist his setting. On the title-page stand these words—and they seem to light up with equal beauty the pages of the Evangel—'By means of sinister fortune, Truth *may* be concealed. Yet by time in spite of fortune, it is most manifestly revealed.' He came unto His own and His own received Him not. Is it not thus we often miss the glory of Christ? It was Jeremy Taylor who linked so supremely the lovely Babe to the Celestial Lord. 'Jesus' he said, 'had a star to illustrate His birth, but a stable for His bed-chamber, and a manger for His cradle.' We are often too tardy to discover in that paradox the claims to His Kingship. This at all events is the view of careful scholars who in their scrutiny of the sources bring Jesus from the clouds to earth. They begin not with the glorified Lord, but with the Babe of Bethlehem. Max Müller exclaims: 'I feel sure that just now nothing is more wanted than to be impressed with the human character of Jesus. It has almost vanished under the extravagant phraseology of hymns and creeds. Yet how much greater is the story of His unselfish life than all the superlatives of later Theology!'

> Feeding their sheep they find the fold of heaven,
> Which whoso enters shall go out no more:
> The living water there, the pastures green,
> The soft fresh air of the celestial shore.

That is why at Christmas-tide we love to turn to Perdita. Her kinship with her neighbours, her laughter, and her fellowship are the only true setting for her royalty. She mingles her thoughts with the villagers. Like Jesus she raises her gladsome voice with men's on the rough road of their rustic life. If it is thus that they grow to admire her, is not this a more winning path by which to learn that she is a queen?

We have set God aloft in the Heavens. If we leave Him there we do dishonour to the immanence of Christ. If we but hold the Beauteous Babe nearer to us, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, we will see the Deity in the depth of His humility. In the quiet pastoral land of memory, He is found. In the helpless cry of infancy, we may hear His whisper. In the delights of this fair world, in the echo of the heavenly voices which break in upon us with His coming, we shall listen to the angels' song. Abiding in these fields of reverie, we can no longer leave Him uncrowned. By His lowly walk and unrewarded labour, He has established His right to reign.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Christmas.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'There are diversities of gifts.'—1 Co 12[4].

'Diversities of gifts' means all kinds of gifts. Let us think of three kinds, though they are not exactly those Paul had in mind.

First, *the gifts we get.* At Christmas-time we often wonder what presents we will receive. Remember that the great Christmas present that began the whole idea of Christmas is what Paul calls God's 'unspeakable' gift, Jesus Christ. Even to our friends or uncles or aunts it is often difficult to write a letter saying how much we have liked their present. When Paul says 'unspeakable' he means that no words of ours are ever enough to say how great was God's kindness and how thankful we are for Jesus. And He has given us the Bible, too, in which we can read for ourselves how Jesus

lived and died and what He taught; and the church where we are called to worship Him. How different it would be to live in a country where there were no churches, no Bibles, no day for worship, and the name of Jesus was not known. Christmas is happy because of the presents we receive, but do not forget those things which are God's gifts to us.

When you get a present people often say, 'Now don't waste it or break it.' What a pity if it were lost or broken the very first day. I have heard of boys who have had a fine new knife of which they were very proud. And they tried to use it as a screwdriver. They thought if they were very careful it would work. But suddenly, instead of turning the screw, the blade snapped off. Oh, we often waste the gifts we get!

Don't let God's gifts be wasted. Since He has sent the Lord Jesus into our world let it make a difference in our hearts. If we have His Word in our Bibles let us read it. If we have a church let us come to it for worship.

Second, *the gifts we give.* Because God has been so kind to us all, it has become the custom in Christian countries on Christmas Day to imitate Him and give presents to one another. On that day men are ashamed not to be generous. Are there any rules about the gifts we give?

Don't you always put 'To So-and-so, with love'? When Jacob in the Old Testament story sent his sons to Egypt to buy corn for the famine and bade them take a present with them for its Ruler, not knowing that it was their own brother Joseph, among the other things he said, 'Take a little honey.' When you give a present give a little honey with it, a kind smile, a happy word. Some people give a pinch of ginger or pepper with their gifts, say something nippy or hard that spoils the whole effect. A boy I knew saved up a good many pennies to buy a knife for his little brother, and that was very kind of him. But as he handed it to him, he said, 'Here's a knife. It's not very sharp, but it will do well enough for you.'

Here is another rule. Think of those who have most need of gifts. Jesus advised people giving a feast to invite the poor and the lame. Don't give presents just to those who will give presents to you. At Christmas-time let us think of the poor and sick and hungry, who need cheer when others are merry. It is a time to be kind to those who have few friends or many troubles.

Last, *the gifts we are.* Some names mean this. The Greeks sometimes called a boy 'Theodore,' which means 'gift of God'; and that name is still used occasionally by parents who are grateful for the gift of a son. If it was a girl the Greeks could call her Theodora, and if that sounds too grand for a little girl it can easily be turned round without changing the sense; 'Dorothy' means 'God's gift.' Children are God's gifts to their parents and when they are good and bright and loving they are doing something useful in the world just by making their parents glad.

The poet, Wordsworth, writes about children:

> trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home:
> Heaven lies about us in our infancy.

But as the years go on some become a care, a burden, a trouble to those who love them. Remember you are meant to be a gift for which your father and mother will thank God because of the joy and help you bring them. Are you going then to be worth something to your family, your school, your town, your country?

Above all, will you give yourself to God? What need has He of gifts?

> Every beast of the forest is mine
> And the cattle on the hills where thousands are.

Yet He asks for our service and devotion. 'My son, give me thine heart.'

The Golden Cross.

By John G. Thornton, B.A.(Oxon.), Glasgow.

'Girt about with truth.'—Eph 6^{14}.

As the old paddle-steamer *Lucy Ashton* wound its way in and out among the ships at anchor in the Firth of Clyde I asked a fellow-passenger why some of the ships had a large golden cross painted on the side. It was no national emblem, for the ships that bore it flew British, Norwegian, or Dutch flags just like the rest.

You have all heard of the mines that float about in the sea and act like magnets, so that when a ship passes nearby, the mine is drawn towards it, strikes the vessel and explodes. One day a heroic naval engineer took one of these mines to pieces, after it had been washed ashore, to see how it worked. And very soon a way was found to prevent ships from attracting these mines. It was done by passing round the hull of the ship a cable charged with a special sort of electric current, which made the vessel as safe as if it were of wood. After this had been done, the ship would be marked with a golden cross, so every one would

know that in future she would be safe from magnetic mines.

Now that golden cross is exactly the same for a ship, as another kind of cross is for every boy and girl. Let me tell you what I mean.

If you take a look through the hymn-book you will see how many hymns there are which talk about life as a voyage, and people as ships, temptations as rocks, and so on :

I feel the winds of God to-day;
To-day my sail I lift,
Though heavy oft with drenching spray,
And torn with many a rift ;
If hope but light the water's crest,
And Christ my bark will use,
I'll seek the seas at His behest,
And brave another cruise.

There you have one of the best of them. I am afraid that if you look for a hymn about magnetic mines you will not find one, because mines are newer than most hymns. But we know all about those floating mines that lurk in our path. And, like ships, we too are made of the kind of stuff that draws mines towards us. Some of us are quick-tempered, and when some one annoys us, we can feel the danger-point drawing closer and closer, just like an ugly mine bobbing in the water. Some of us are so made that we attract laziness, or untruthfulness, or selfishness, and not one of us is so perfect as to pass by all temptations without even noticing them. St Paul speaks of 'the sin that doth most easily beset us,' and we all have at least one.

But some are prepared against these drifting dangers. They are marked with a cross—not a gold one made of paint, but the saving Cross of Jesus. They are safe because they are 'girded about with truth,' like a cable charged with secret power, a power to master the floating perils of life. If you ride a bicycle you know that to avoid a big stone you must look at the road ahead. If you fix your eyes on the stone you will steer into it. If you want to avoid the mines, turn your back on the dangers and fix your eyes on the Saviour and Master of all mariners. Leave no room in your ship for the evil things that might attract those mines you know so well. Mark your ship with a Cross. Others will follow, and you may guide a whole convoy to safety.

Great Pilot of my onward way,
Thou wilt not let me drift ;
I feel the winds of God to-day,
To-day my sail I lift.

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

God's Choice of Men.

BY THE REVEREND C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D., ST ALBANS, HERTS.

'And there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.'—Gn 32^{24}.

Why did God choose Jacob? There is little doubt that, if the story of Jacob and Esau were not in the Bible, most of those who read it would prefer Esau. He is straightforward, unsuspecting, generous, forgiving, a hearty 'son of the field'—in short, the kind of man for a hero. Jacob, on the other hand, seems to modern eyes to have set himself to cheat, in turn, his father Isaac, his brother Esau, and his succourer Laban. He is as wily and slippery as Ulysses. Yet God chose Jacob. Why?

The reason is that God does not choose men by what they are, but by what they may become. It is easy to suggest parallels. Blake has celebrated the tiger in famous lines :

Tiger, tiger, burning bright
In the forests of the night,
What immortal hand or eye
Could frame thy fearful symmetry?

If this splendid creature be compared with man as man began—an ugly, ape-like denizen of caves—which is the better? Can any one hesitate to vote for the tiger? But zoologists tell us that the tiger has reached its best—that, along its line of evolution, 'the course of nature can no further go.' It is all that it can ever be. Man, on the other hand, however unlovely he was millenniums ago, could develop. It is from this mean origin that the race of beings grew that produced Moses and Plato and Shakespeare and Beethoven. Can a tiger compare with these? God knew that, according to 'the flesh,' His own Son could some day become, not a tiger, but a man. We judge by what is, God by what will be—we by the present, He by the future—we by the seen, He by the unseen.

There is the same law within the limits of mankind. For instance, here is a little lad whose chubby fingers are always clutching a pencil or a crayon and scrawling, to his mother's despair, on wall or book or table. What he scrawls is not to be compared for execution with the cartoons in the poorest of comic papers. But wait a while. Wait till the lad's powers have been developed and disciplined. Some day another great artist will add the splendour of the sun to the splendour of the sea. But the comic cartoons will still be

just about what they are. In such a realm even men agree that the true criterion is not the present but the future, and that the root question is, 'What will this lad become?'

We give to Esau the kind of admiration that we give to the tiger. One can see the difference between him and his brother over the 'red pottage.' Esau is coming in from hunting empty-handed—a rare thing with him. Jacob, who has awaited such a rare day, sees him coming and sets to work seething pottage. He pretends that he has not seen his brother but takes good care that his brother sees him. 'Give me some of that red stuff, Jacob.' That is just about the literal meaning of the Hebrew words. Jacob glances up—'Well, yes—but what about that birthright of yours?' If Esau had been a modern, his answer would have been 'Birthright? What is a birthright? One can't *eat* birthrights!' It is perhaps not altogether an anachronism to take the obscure word 'birthright' to denote at bottom something like what we mean by 'an ideal.' It is notorious that we cannot clearly define ideals—let alone eat them! Jacob is seeking a good thing, even if, according to our ethics, he is seeking it in a wrong way. He has the right kind of appetite. Or again, Esau no doubt often slept in the woods and made a pillow of a stone, and beside him a ladder was set, and the angels went and came, and above all there was God waiting—but Esau saw none of these things, for he 'had no use' for them. He just went on sleeping. But Jacob, though he slept on the earth, looked into heaven, and 'as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.' God could draw this man up the ladder, rung by patient rung, to Himself. He that hath eyes to see, let him see.

So too at Jabbok. With what does Jacob wrestle there? With the situation—for here is outraged Esau with four hundred brisk fellows at his heels. With himself—for he knows that he is 'rightly called Jacob.' Yet fundamentally it is God who wrestles with this man. If God wrestle long enough He can make this man, as He cannot make Esau, into a true heir of Abraham, 'the friend of God.' God chooses men, not by what they are, but by what they are willing to let Him make of them, even though it be in spite of themselves! 'Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated.'

It is the same with the two races that sprang from these brothers. As it happens, throughout much of the Bible there is an account of the Edomites, as well as of the Israelites. When the 'Children of Israel' were a slave-race in Egypt, the Edomites had already many a 'duke.' Which race was the better so far? But Edom soon reached the limit of its evolution. It remained 'at one stay.' But it was from the slave-race that Moses came, and Elijah and Isaiah and all the Prophets. The last great Edomite was Herod the king, who slaughtered the Innocents; the last great Israelite was Jesus the Christ, who saved the world.

It is easy to-day to apply this principle to races. Like Esau, with his four hundred men, a large part of the German race seems, at least for the time being, to trust in mere force. So long as that is so, it cannot be anything better than its ambition. It is foolish to pretend that Britain has no faults. Indeed, it is possible, by selecting episodes in its history, to say 'Art thou not rightly named Jacob?' At this time it falls to the Church to see that this is not forgotten. In particular, who can say that in the ten years after the last war we did altogether what was right? Shall we do better next time? Yet, when all is said, we do *want* some of the right things—freedom of thought and word and life, and brotherhood between peoples. It has not been easy for God to bring us to this mind, and His wrestling with our race is not over, but we have largely learnt the right appetite. So we may wrestle through this war, hoping and praying for 'the breaking of the day.' Fundamentally 'our wrestling is not with flesh and blood,' but 'with spiritual wickedness.' If we keep this mind, we may hope to 'withstand in the evil day, and, having beaten down all, to stand.'

Yet the New Testament application is primarily to the individual. Why did Jesus prefer certain 'publicans and sinners' to certain Pharisees? Fundamentally it was because the former did want to be like Him, and the latter did not. The typical Pharisee of the Gospels was a finished product. Nothing more was possible on his line of evolution. 'As touching the law, blameless.' It is just the same to-day with many 'men of the world.' As they themselves claim, they 'keep the Ten Commandments,' and a few more than ten—and they do not desire anything further. The converted drunkard has not so far lived a life as good—but he does long for a higher life than theirs. So, indeed, does a *discontented* 'Pharisee.' In the seventh chapter of Romans we can see such a one wrestling with the situation that Jesus and Stephen had made—with his own 'lower self,' the 'flesh,'—and with God. 'O wretched man that I am,' he cries, but also, in effect, 'I will not let thee go.' Charles Wesley's poem, 'Come, O

Thou Traveller unknown,' is just the seventh of Romans in verse, and his brother John's declaration that the 'one thing needful' is a 'desire to be saved from sin' is just another way of saying 'She loved much.' God chooses all those who are seriously willing that He should make them like His Son. This does not mean that He will not discipline them—rather, it usually means that He will. It was Jacob that was disciplined, not Esau. Blériot, who first flew the Channel, limped down to his plane on crutches. Sometimes it is only the wounded that prevail. 'I look not,' said Samuel Rutherford, 'to win away to my home without wounds and blood.' It is not easy to climb the ladder of God, but God sees to it that every steadfast climber reaches the top. To change the figure, for the wrestler in the night who just holds on there is but one end—'the breaking of the day.'

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

God Reveals Himself in Earthly Form.

By the Reverend Charles Smith, B.A., St John's College, Durham.

Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me.'—Jn 6^{45} (R.V.).

These words are in the long discourse on the bread of life. There has occurred some argument over our Lord's use of terms. He has described Himself as having come down from heaven to do the will of the Father who sent Him: and He has promised eternal life to all those who should come to Him. The Jews among His hearers at once picked Him up over this, as it seemed to them, excessive language. Our Lord did not set Himself up as the inspired mouthpiece of oracles not His own, of a revelation that was not a part of Himself at all, as the prophets and Moses had done—as the mere vehicle through which the message passed like water through a pipe. By no means. On the contrary, He was the message Himself. Not only did He lead men to the Father: the Father actually led them to the Son: the Father did the teaching, and if men but heard and learnt the lesson, they arrived at the Son. It was a large claim. It reversed all that the questioners had ever thought of the nature of revelation. Small wonder that they pointed out the humble origin of Him who made it. Apart from the natural human tendency to humiliate one who lays claim to powers greater than ordinary, the crux of their objection seems to have been that they had difficulty in believing that God could or would speak, as it were, indirectly through any earthly medium. Directly, yes. He had so spoken through the prophets when they were not thought of as contributing of themselves to the message that they transmitted. But indirectly, no. For that would require that the person in himself was expressing through his own nature something of the divine. And that was a claim that they could never admit. Earthly was earthly and heavenly was heavenly: the one might choose to transmit itself through the other, but it could never actually be in it in substance. So, because Christ was of earthly parentage, they mocked at His claims to be the true Bread come down from heaven.

God in common things. What would we know of God were we deprived in this fashion of the mediation of all seemingly quite earthly things? Suppose that Christ had never become man; and that we had no clue in the little and common things of the material world. Or go further and say, as many have tried to say, and as still more unconsciously think in their hearts, that what we know of God can come entirely from within our own selves—that we know and see Him fully without any mediation at all. How much should we know then? We are made in the image of God and should therefore know something: but we have debased the image, and the knowledge would therefore be perverted by our own minds. Broadly, there would no doubt be a certain resemblance between our several notions; but we should end by each forming a God in his own image—we do now, even with the picture of Christ to guide us—and the images of no two men would agree. We should, in fact, be in a state either of barbarous superstition or of that woolly and muddle-headed idealism typical of so many of our agnostic humanitarians.

When we examine our own souls' progress, we find that overwhelmingly the greater part of it has come to us through the mediation of some material thing or through someone who showed in his own person something of the divine nature. A poem of Evelyn Underhill's runs like this:

> Meekly I fit my stature to your need.
> In beggar's part
> About your gates I shall not cease to plead . . .
> As man to speak with man . . .
> Till by such art
> I shall achieve my Immemorial Plan,
> Pass the low lintel of the human heart.

God matches His revelation of Himself to our need. We are spiritual beings with an earthly body; so He clothes His spiritual truths in an earthly

garment for our apprehension—forsaking his starry wings for the highway of humility. Let us never despise earthly things. They are sacraments revealing spiritual truths to him who looks at them with spiritual eyes. It was the voice of a child saying, 'Take read' which transformed St. Augustine from a dissatisfied pagan philosopher into one of the pillars of the Church; it was the sight of a running stream which brought Ignatius to the knowledge of God; the great German mystic Boehme saw the revelation of his God while gazing at an old pewter dish; if we will but look with the eyes of a Francis de Sales we shall find that every daisy is a miniature replica of the purity of God, and every rock left unmoved by the tide a symbol of His steadfast unchangeableness. These are the little things in which God has willed to reveal Himself to our eyes; the shadows showing the substance which lies behind them: the material signs of a creation that is through and through sacramental. And from them comes our knowledge of God the creator; of God the sum of beauty and of harmony; of God the spirit of truth and proportion; of God the artificer of the celestial motions and the earthly seasons. In short, of all that God the Creator means to us.

Choice of interest necessary. God shows Himself to us in the things of the material creation. Yes, but if we would see them as revelations of His spirit, we must look for the right things. When we watch cows grazing in a meadow they seem to go on steadily cropping everything that comes in their way. In truth they are selecting with the utmost care just those things that are of benefit to them for food. Poisonous herbs are left alone and all their concentrated attention is given to the rich and beneficial grasses which can readily be turned into nourishment for their bodies. It must be like that with our choice of interests in the world of material things. God created the world and reveals Himself in it; but some things are of more spiritual significance to each of us than others. For some they are the great peaceful and awesome things of Nature—the heavens and the sea and the quiet of desolate expanses. For others they may be the reverse of these.

Christian culture and example. Another way in which the thought of all of us has been shaped spiritually is through the medium of the Christian culture in which we live; or by the example or influence of those we have learned to admire. All of which are other instances of the things of this world bringing to us something of the knowledge of the eternal world. We are, all of us, whether we like it or not, the creatures—and largely the creations—of our own generation and place. So far as the influence is spiritual, so far is our knowledge of God once again mediated by an earthly thing. Which of us would ever have come to the knowledge of God at all if we had been left entirely to our own unaided devices? The influence of the institutions of organized religion; the influence of Christian parents and of well-chosen friends—these are the things which have brought most of us to the knowledge of the loving-kindness of God Himself.

It is true to say that we are shaped by the spiritual aspects of the society in which we live. There is the privilege of sharing in the work which the spirit of God has achieved among men up to our time. But it is true also to say that we join—or ought to join—in shaping that society. And that is the responsibility. We are given the onerous and proud duty of co-operation with the divine spirit, and of so moulding that society that we may leave it a more powerful vehicle of the spirit than we found it. All alike can show the humility and loving-kindness which are the crowning graces of the divine life. And these are the things which act as sacraments revealing the spiritual realities to men. As Julian of Norwich says: 'And then I saw that each kind compassion that a man has on his fellow-Christian, with charity, it is Christ in him.'

Main revelation in Christ. If our nature is throughout so encumbered by its flesh that our knowledge of the things of the spirit must come to us in a guise fitted to our needs; and if the God who so loved the world that He chose to reveal Himself to it in His creation—if He should will to reveal fully what He there reveals in part—what other means would He adopt than this—that for us, who see His working most clearly in the spirit of our fellows, He should show Himself perfectly in a man like as we are? And how could He better draw us to Himself, or teach us than, as St. John says, by pointing us to the perfect manifestation of Himself in an earthly form, in One who was the summary of all created things?

When we have heard from the Father and our eyes have been unsealed to the spiritual significance of the created world, when we have heard enough to recognize the revelation of Him in the spiritual aspects of society, when we have so heard His voice that we can know its message through human lips, then we can assert with the Christ of St. John that when we have heard and learnt the message of the Father, we shall be drawn by Him to look for Him and to see Him as fully as our earthly

nature will allow, in the face of the Christ whom He sent to be the final and complete revelation of Himself to men, the last, and only perfect instance of the spiritual manifesting itself in a material form. Unto me cometh every man that hath learned of the Father.

Christmas Day.

By the Very Reverend J. S. MacArthur, B.D., M.A., The College, Millport.

'A little child shall lead them.'—Is 11[6].

Our holy faith is full of paradox. We make of Christmas the children's festival, the season of jollity and merrymaking, when we try to give the children a good time and enjoy ourselves by becoming as like children as we can for a little while. Yet Christmas is the Feast of the Incarnation, that mystery so august and sublime that when we utter the words in the Creed—'And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man,' we bow our heads in reverence to Him who so humbled Himself, to Him in whose name every knee shall bow. So, too, in the carols that we sing, beneath the note of childlike gaiety that first strikes the ear, we can catch an undertone of other-worldly mystery.

This paradox is no new discovery. More than fifteen hundred years ago there lived in Constantinople an archbishop, Nestorius, who scandalized the faithful and got into serious trouble because he was reported, probably falsely reported, to have said that he could not regard an infant three or four months old as God. And in our own day a more cautious theologian has said that our attitude towards a little child does not seem to be the fitting one to adopt towards the Redeemer and Saviour of mankind.

We feel the difficulty, and perhaps that is why our keeping of Christmas splits into two parts that we find it hard to bring together again, namely, our worship in church and our celebration of Christmas at home. Let us think the matter out. Let us think what children mean to us and what Christ means to us.

Note to begin with that the birthday of Jesus Christ affects our whole attitude to children, not only on Christmas Day but every day. Had Jesus Christ never had a birthday in Bethlehem I doubt whether the birthdays of our children would mean quite the same to us as they do. His holy childhood has given to all childhood a quality and a value that it would not otherwise have had.

Think of the appeal that children make to us. It is so easy to be sentimental about them and so futile. Let us try to get beyond sentimentality. Children appeal to us because of their helplessness and dependence on us. They look to us for so much, and it is in our power to give them so much happiness. It is just here that sentimentality has its chance. The trustfulness and confidence of children is so flattering to us. But if that trust and confidence are not to be betrayed we must be prepared to suffer and to do for their sakes. And once we begin to pay the price of our emotions sentimentality vanishes.

But must not our attitude to *this Child* be the exact opposite? Surely it is we who are dependent on Him. Yet in the days of His flesh He too was dependent on men and women for the accomplishment of His mission. A human mother bore Him, tended Him, loved Him. In her commemoration we sing:

> Thy Babe He lay upon thy breast,
> To thee He turned for food;
> Thy gentle nursing soothed to rest
> The Incarnate Son of God.

Such was His choice then, and such is still His choice. He still places Himself in our hands. It is still possible that we cannot find room for Him, like the innkeeper at Bethlehem; but, if we do receive Him, then we must be prepared both to suffer and to do for Him—if our love of Him is to mean anything at all.

Then again, with the joy that our children bring into our lives there come graver thoughts. We wonder what their lives are going to be, what temptations, what sorrows are in store for them, and our conscience pricks us, for we know that we have had our share in making the world what it is, a world with infinite possibilities of suffering and sorrow and sin. The shame of it, that those little ones should have to pay even in part the price of our shortcomings! But on *this Child* are laid the sins of the whole world, and by His stripes we are healed.

Yet when we think of the future of our children our thoughts are not entirely gloomy. A great Christian philosopher[1] says that 'the whole charm of children, their peculiar human charm, is inevitably connected with the thought and the hope that they will be better than we—not quantitatively better by one or two degrees, but essentially—that they will be men of a different life, that in them indeed is our salvation—for us and for our forefathers. . . .

[1] Vladimir Solovyof, *The Justification of the Good*, 141.

'Every one is agreed that the special charm of children is in their innocence. But this actual innocence could not be a source of joy and delight to us were we certain that it is bound to be lost. There would be nothing comforting or instructive in the thought that their angels behold the face of the Heavenly Father were it accompanied by the conviction that these angels will be sure to become immediately blind.'

In *this Child* all the hopes, all the dreams, all the prayers that centre in the children that we love, and that can never be more than partially fulfilled in them, find their perfect realization, for in Him is the yea, in Him the Amen to all the promises of God to us. These children remain dear to us, but they grow up all too like us, not always so much better than we have been; but *this Child* is indeed of a different life, the life of the Son of God. His innocence remains unspotted by any taint of sin, and in Him is our salvation.

And so we see that in order to celebrate this great Feast of the Incarnation we do not want to forget the little children whose happiness is our concern just now. Our attitude towards them ought to teach us something of the fitting attitude to *this Child*. Like them He asks for our love and our service, yes, and our suffering. Like them He arouses our shame, our pity, our hope. But He does more; He asks for our worship. Come let us adore Him.

First Sunday after Christmas.

When the Signs are Removed.

By the Reverend C. Walter Rose, B.A.,
Nailsworth, Glos.

'And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it.'—Is 30^{21}.

Take a journey by road to-day, and you find that journey's end is not as easy as usual. We live in a land where everything is being done to remove or cover up the signs of direction and landmarks new and old. Sign-posts are taken down, mile-stones are removed, and place-names painted out. Travellers must fall back on less artificial ways of direction, and the wonder is whether we have become so reliant upon the modern aids to geography as to have lost the native and natural lore which served old-time wayfarers. Sign-posts are gone, but the stars shine on, and the sun has his going forth and circuit. The call of to-day is to face the hazards of the signless cross-roads with a steady head and a brave heart.

It would not be so serious were it not one of the outward signs of a world which has lost its sense of direction and control. The standards and signs of ordered civilization and international dealings have been cast down, so that in Isaiah's words, 'Judgment is turned away backward and justice standeth afar off, for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter.' Because of these things mankind is in travail together. What a removal there has been of things which were made for the ordered guidance and protection of our life!

If we only look at things seen, and take the world about us as all there is, despair closes in.

Can we, and should we, so limit our outlook and prospect as if this passing world were God's all? When we lift our thoughts to Him at all, however we express it, we simply have to think of a realm in which this earth is a very little thing, however special and favoured a place it may have in His creative purpose. Even with this present world have we not spurned the signs He has written in His creation and generous Providence concerning that purpose in our trusteeship of His earth? They remain when all man-made rules for community are shaken and broken, and are stars of hope for the future.

But God's Realm is infinite, and transcends territory and geography, and the shakings of time and place. The language of the Bible and of the saints speaks of Heaven, the world above, 'the Jerusalem that is above,' and these are but symbols of that which is beyond our spatial ideas.

More, we are made aware in our own hearts of that which beats with the life and spirit of that world above, that which lives not by bread alone, and is not tied down to the geography of this earth. Sir Cecil Spring-Rice in 'The Two Fatherlands' sings first of his love for his country to which he vows the service of his love, but in the second verse he says there is another country. You cannot count her armies, and you may not see her king. That is a song of the world within, which yet can make touch with the world above, and know its secret of Divine Peace—

> Her fortress is a faithful heart, her pride is suffering;
> And soul by soul and silently her shining bounds increase,
> And her ways are ways of gentleness and all her paths are peace.

The soul of man has never been without means of finding and exploring the resources of that better country. When the outward covenants are broken, there is a law written in the heart, and a spirit of

sacrifice which is invincible. When there is no way out, there is a way up, or rather, a way that is let down from Heaven, as Jacob's shining ladder.

Isaiah told the people of Judah, when Jerusalem was in peril from the Assyrian hosts, that trouble might be their teacher to bring them to God, and to open eyes blinded by political prudence, and hearts hardened against the word of the Lord. In the tribulation which might soon be upon them, 'bread of adversity and water of affliction,' they might come to listen to the inward voice. 'And thine ears shall hear a voice behind thee, saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it."' The idea that God Himself is a way when all other roads are stopped runs through the Bible. A later singer in the same book of Isaiah tells of a way of Holiness in which the ransomed of the Lord should walk.

To Jesus in His pioneering by faith the voice came in the dark testings at the cross-roads where all the visible signs failed, and His way was barred. Because He did not fail nor was He discouraged, He could claim, 'I am the true and living way,' and from His triumph over death His voice sounds for us to-day, a gospel of the onward, endless way.

This gospel acts in two ways, most often fused together in actual experience. While it strikes at all our pride and convicts of failure, its final word is not condemnation, but God's merciful call, 'Come unto me.' It is the word which so often we spurn or put aside when outward things do not press us. Has it not been largely so with our generation, and with us as a nation? Now as a people we are straitened and driven in on ourselves. He is far from the truth who would claim that, whether for endurance and defence, or for the overthrow of injustice we are sufficient of ourselves. Humbly we need to turn back to God, and lay hold of His strength. It is of the Lord's mercy that, far from forsaking His people in trouble, He would use it to manifest Himself, and from behind—'our help in ages past'—we may hear His voice, and lo, a way shall be there through a dark and threatening world. 'Wherefore, as the Holy Spirit saith, "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts."'

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

Christ as Master.

BY THE REVEREND LEONARD PLESTED, WALLINGTON.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 7^{21}.

When in Palestine Dr. H. E. Fosdick visited the American College at Beirut, Syria. He was asked to address the students. Nationally and religiously they were a cosmopolitan company. Among those students were representatives of sixteen different religions. What could one say to such a mixed company as that? Well, Dr. Fosdick began his address thus: 'I am not going to ask anyone here to change his religion. But I am going to ask every one honestly to face this question, "What is your religion doing to your character?"' I don't know what Dr. Fosdick said after that. I should very much like to know. It was a fine opening. For if a man's religion is not doing anything worth while to his character, it is of precious little use to God, to the man himself, or to anybody else.

These words from the lips of our Lord are calculated to make us face that kind of question. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' If our religion is simply a matter of words, simply a matter of correct opinion, and does not produce character and conduct, it won't get us anywhere. Our Lord has no use for us, even though we give Him His right Name, if we do not the things that He said, if we do not the will of His Father which is in heaven. Our Lord judges us, not by our words, not by the intensity of our emotional feelings, but by the things that we do, by the fruits we produce, 'Not every one that saith . . . but he that doeth.' At the Judgment Day many will say, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name done many wonderful works?' And the Lord will have to say, 'I never knew you.' And in that day many who did not know the truth in theory will hear the words, 'Come ye blessed of my Father, receive the Kingdom prepared for such as you,' because, in the service of the least of His brethren, they rendered service unto Him. Although not knowing whence the light came, they responded to what they saw of the light that seeks to light every man coming into the world.

The Lord judges us now, as He will judge us then, not by the intensity of our emotional feelings, but by the channels into which we turn our lives. And that may be good news to some who cannot share the emotion which they hear others describe, to those who cannot enter into the rapture of certain hymns. It is possible to be deeply moved in feeling and to do nothing with it; possible, indeed, to live in a manner quite contrary to such feeling. That is simply emotional self-indulgence, and it doesn't bring one anywhere—except into greater condemnation. There are people who are prepared to 'dedicate' themselves on every possible occasion,

but it makes no difference to the lives they live. It doesn't make them any less selfish, any more thoughtful or generous towards others, any more Christian in business, or noble in life. It gives them a lovely feeling, but it does not issue in lovely fruits. Emotion should move us to do something. If it fails to do that, it were better we had never felt it. Our Lord was greatly pained by those who said, 'Lord, Lord' and did not the things that He said.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not disparaging emotion. I would that we had more emotion; more of the emotion that St. Paul felt when he said: 'The Son of God loved me and gave himself for me.' 'The love of Christ constraineth us . . . that we who live should henceforth live, not unto ourselves, but unto him who loved us and gave himself for us.' The thought that the Son of God loved him and gave Himself for him sent a torrent of emotion surging through the heart and mind of St. Paul. But it was emotion that issued in character and life and service. It was emotion that was transmitted to a dynamo, and it produced light and power. In speaking, as our Lord Himself spoke, of the uselessness and hopelessness of the emotion that says, 'Lord, Lord,' and does nothing, I am pleading for an emotion that is full of glory, an emotion that brings us to His feet in gratitude of heart, and sends us forth to live for Him, and also to do the things that He said.

The question is, Is Christ to be our Master, or our Mascot? What is a mascot? It is something that we hope will keep things right for us, or put things right for us, quite apart from any consideration of our character. And it is amazing, in this enlightened land of ours, how many people have faith in charms and mascots of various kinds. They set them on themselves and on their possessions. And, as in the days of His flesh, there are those who would make a mascot of Christ. They say, 'Lord, Lord,' but they do not the will of His Father in heaven. To call Him 'Lord, Lord,' and not to do the things that He said, is to use His Name as a charm; it is to make a mascot of Christ. And Christ will be nothing less than Master. He will be nothing less than Lord, not in name only, but in fact, in deed and in truth.

> If Jesus comes, He comes to reign;
> To reign, and with no partial sway.
> Thoughts must be slain that disobey.

A man came running to Jesus one day and said, 'Good Master.' Our Lord arrested him with the question, 'Why callest thou me good?' That is, 'What do you mean by it? Are you prepared to follow the kind of life that I stand for?' He will accept no lip service; nothing but the service of the life. He will be Master, or nothing.

Christianity is not a matter of holding particular theological opinions. It is a matter of being possessed, cleansed, transformed in life and character, energized in life and service, by the living Spirit of Christ. Christianity is not a matter of being orthodox in opinion, but orthodox in life, of living 'not unto ourselves, but unto Him who died for us, and rose again.' It is possible to be orthodox, strenuously orthodox in opinion, and to deny the spirit of the Lord; to put theological opinions in the place of the quality of the life. It is possible to give Christ His true name, to call Him 'Lord, Lord,' and yet to be far from Him. To do that is to make a charm, a mascot, of Christianity. It is to make a mascot of theological opinions. It is to make a mascot of Christ. And such mascots are like all other mascots. They don't work. Their power to charm is a fiction. They simply produce a false sense of security. And the day dawns when even that false sense of security is stripped away. In that day many will say, 'Lord, have we not in thy Name done many things?' And the Lord will answer, 'I never knew you.'

You may set great store upon a particular orthodoxy, or you may attend Divine worship regularly. To that extent you cry 'Lord, Lord,' and you think that that will put you right with God. But what you are doing is to make a mascot of a few opinions about God, of a formal attendance at service. And Christ refuses to allow you to use Him, or His Church, or anything that is His, in this way. He will be your Master, or nothing; the Lord of your life, or your Judge. If you think that a little lip service will mean acceptance with Him, He rejects you now, as He will reject you at the last. I am not forgetting the love of Christ. In love He died to save you. In love He rose again to give you life indeed. In love He seeks to save you now. But He cannot pretend that you are different from what you are. He cannot save you if you simply call Him 'Lord, Lord,' and will not permit Him to be the Lord of your life and actions. You must allow the cleansing love and power that stream from Calvary's cross to possess you, to transform you in life and character. You must allow the living Christ to be your Lord in deed and in truth.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Windows, Doors, Locks.—In Palestine, and indeed throughout the whole of the East, windows as now understood were not in existence. Those of glass, in fact, were not in common use till Roman and Byzantine times. In the early Israelite period ordinary houses, particularly those of the poor, were either lighted and ventilated from the doors (a method not uncommon still), or were simply provided with small openings, not more than about two feet in diameter, high up in the wall, usually about six feet or more from the ground. This scantiness of 'window' provision, resulting in a somewhat darkened interior, was considered desirable in order to preserve the inmates from the scorching heat of the sun and the entrance of dust. It was also encouraged, no doubt, by the Israelite builders, who had no knowledge as yet of the construction of arches. They probably found lintels made of solid stone to be too costly and heavy, while wooden ones, even though strong enough to bear the weight of the masonry above, had the serious disadvantage of being combustible. As a general rule, therefore, a 'window' (Heb. *ḥallōn*) was no more than a narrow opening, framed with two long bricks or stones set end to end in such a way as not to weaken the wall. The smoke from the family hearth (cf. Is 30^{14}) escaped as best it could through these openings or through the doorway, as there was no chimney in our sense of the term (in Hos 13^{3}, the only text where 'chimney' is mentioned, the translation should be 'window' or 'casement'). Very few ancient buildings in the Near East have been found standing to the level of these apertures, but sufficient evidence is afforded in Egyptian and Assyrian sculptures and other representations of the period. Some rectangular slabs of hard stone or basalt which have been discovered, and which are bevelled and pierced with holes, have been regarded by some scholars as window structures, but the probability is that they are mill-hoppers belonging to hand-mills (cf. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexicon*, col. 163).

In the dwellings of the rich and in the royal palaces there were sometimes large and well-constructed windows, probably lower down in the wall. The Biblical writers refer to these with some degree of curiosity and even admiration, as in 1 K 6^{4}, where Solomon's temple is said to have had 'windows of narrowing frames' (according to the Hebrew text), *i.e.* probably broad within and narrow without (cf. R.V.m.). Jeremiah, on the other hand, manifests indignation at the ostentatious luxury of Jehoiakim, King of Judah, who boasted of his 'wide house and spacious chambers,' with corresponding ornamental windows (Jer 22^{14}, probably bay-windows of some kind). These larger dwellings appear to have had lattices—sometimes decorated, no doubt—on the windows, after the Egyptian manner (cf. Jg 5^{28}, Pr 7^{6} R.V.). In some cases, such as harems, these were probably fixtures, so that no one could open them. At the same time, many windows in the larger buildings seem to have been entirely open, like those in the poorer houses referred to above, or at least had lattices that could open when necessary (cf. 2 K 13^{17}), reminding us of the square windows, framed in stonework, represented frequently on the ivories from Nimrud, Arslan-Tash, and Samaria, and showing a woman's face looking out. This was the case with the palace window at Jezreel (2 K $9^{30ff.}$), for the chamberlains were able to throw Jezebel out on to the street.

Doors were generally made of wood, as at the present day, but in special cases were plated with bronze or strengthened in some way with metal. It is in this sense that we must understand the 'doors of brass (bronze)' mentioned by Isaiah (45^{2} R.V.) and Babylon's 'gates of bronze' referred to by Herodotus (i. 179). Examples of such may be seen in the bronze gate-bands from Balâwât, preserved in the British Museum, containing figured representations made by Shalmaneser III. to record his conquests. It is evident that the metallurgists or smiths of the time could not have cast doors or gates in a single piece, but they could brace the wood with bronze or other metal. There were no 'hinges' such as we understand them: doors usually swung on large pegs or pivots (Heb. *ṣîrim*, translated 'hinges' in Pr 26^{14}), projecting from them above and below, and turning in hard stone or metal sockets firmly fixed in the masonry—the upper one in the stone which served as a lintel and the lower one in the threshold. In the case of heavy doors, the pivots were probably cased with bronze, while those in Solomon's temple were sheathed in gold (1 K 7^{50}). In practically all houses, whether small or great, every effort was

made to secure a single stone for the threshold, but if the dimensions were too great for this (as in the case of wide city gates), two or more solid stones were placed evenly together. An excellent illustration of this method of swinging the doors may be found in those consisting of a single slab of stone which have been discovered in the ancient Hauran, with their stone pivots still *in situ*, and many similar ones have been found in tombs of the Roman and Byzantine epoch.

There were satisfactory means in existence for preventing unlawful entrance into cities and houses. The gates of a city were closed from within by strong bars of wood or metal (Heb. *berîḥîm*, cf. Jg 16^3, 2 Ch 14^7, Jer 51^{30}, La 2^9, Nah 3^{13}, etc.), the extremities of which rested in an opening made in the masonry of the uprights. In the case of house-doors a bolt was used, called in the Hebrew *manʿûl* or *minʿâl* (cf. Ca 5^5 R.V., Neh 3^3 R.V., as well as Dt 33^{25} where the A.V. incorrectly has 'shoes' and the R.V. 'bars'). Certain house-doors, especially later on, were provided with real locks which could only be opened by means of the key (*maphtêaḥ*), which was kept by the householder or responsible guardian (sometimes a woman, cf. 2 S 4^6, R.V.m.). This ancient type of lock consists of a short piece of wood fastened upright on the inside of the door adjoining the doorpost. A square wooden bolt slides through it at right angles into a socket in the post. The bolt is hollow, and has three to six holes at one part of its upper surface. When it is shot into the socket metal pins drop from the upright into the holes (which correspond to them in position), and the bolt cannot now be withdrawn without the proper key. This latter consists of a flat piece of wood, furnished in its upper surface with a number of pins in exactly the same position as the others. The person wishing to enter the house puts in his hand by a hole in the door (cf. Ca 5^4), and introduces the key into the hollow bolt. By pressing up the key he is then able to raise the pins in the holes of the bolt, which is thus easily withdrawn (cf. Jg $3^{23ff.}$, 1 Ch 9^{27}, etc.). It is evident that, unless the key-pins correspond exactly with the holes, the bolt cannot be released.

Beth-Shemesh (1 S^6).

In our previous article a résumé was given of the successive stages through which this 'City of the Sun' (represented now by the mound of *Rumeileh*, at *ʿAin Shems*) passed in olden times. Professors Elihu Grant and G. Ernest Wright have furnished additional information in their latest report on the excavations (published by Haverford College), from which the following facts may be gleaned:

Industries.—*First*, one of the most prominent of these was Agriculture (or 'Husbandry,' as the Bible terms it). Several excellent granaries in the shape of square bins (cf. the 'barns' of Mt 6^{26}) have been discovered, dating from about 1600 B.C. onward. Later on, round silos were introduced, and some chaff found at the bottom of these has been examined under a microscope and pronounced to be from wheat. One large silo, about seventeen feet deep and resting upon bedrock, appears to have been constructed in the tenth century, during the reign of David or Solomon. It is of tremendous width, twenty-four feet across from north to south and twenty-one from east to west, and is the largest which has yet been described from excavations in Palestine, with the exception of some at Gerar which belong to the Persian period. Probably it had some connexion with Solomon's fiscal system, for which Beth-Shemesh was one of the official centres (1 K 4^9). *Second*, from the tenth century onward olive-oil and wine industries (the methods of which resembled each other, cf. Jl 2^{24}) were common, as evidenced by the large number of presses discovered, and they flourished much better here in the Shephelah than in higher regions. The crushing was done on a stone slab, which had just enough slant on it to cause the juice to flow into a catch-basin (hollowed out of stone) by its side. The Israelites frequently exported large quantities of olive oil to the West by way of Tyre (Ezk 27^{17}) and to Egypt (Hos 12^1). *Third*, another form of productive effort, before the introduction of iron, was the making of implements of copper or bronze (called 'brass' everywhere in our E.V., except in R.V.m.). What is believed to be the earliest copper furnace found in Palestine has been uncovered (dating some time between 1400 and 1200 B.C.), with the ashes still within it, and the green copper stain on the walls, showing that at this early time the smiths at Beth-Shemesh were doing their smelting on the spot (the ore coming probably from Moab and Edom). Even in Solomon's time, and much later, bronze seems to have been used, rather than iron, for small objects, such as arrow-heads, needles, punches, and small plough-points.

Jewellery.—The inhabitants of Beth-Shemesh seem to have had a fondness for personal adornment, like others in Palestine and the ancient Near East (cf. Gn 24^{53}, Ex 3^{22}, Ezk 28^{13}, etc.). The interesting discovery has been made of a potful of jewellery objects (*c.* 1500–1200 B.C.), several hundred in number, all crushed and corroded together;

earrings, beads, scaraboids, scarabs, seals, rings, and neck ornaments. Most of these are carnelian, but many are of gold, and some of serpentine, diorite, rock crystal, bronze, and paste. The whole collection had been hastily and carelessly thrust into the pot, and may have been the loot of some thief, or hurriedly gathered and hidden in some time of danger. Most of the excavations in Palestine have revealed an unexpected profusion of jewellery (cf. Is $3^{18ff.}$).

Megiddo.

Since our last reference (March 1939) to the important excavations which Mr. Gordon Loud has been conducting at Megiddo, the main strategic post on the high road between Egypt and Asia, he has discovered fresh evidence of its culture and worship in pre-Israelite times :

Palatial Houses.—In an area dating from about 1950–1850 B.C., he has found three large buildings, close to each other but separate, and all identical in size and form, which resemble the 'megaron' type (a house or palace of many rooms) often referred to in Homer (especially in the *Odyssey*). Mr. Loud describes them as 'an astonishing group of buildings,' as they certainly are at that early age (about five hundred years at least before Joshua), when architects were supposed to be non-existent.

Ablution.—Of more interest perhaps to Biblical students is the discovery, in the corner of a large court, of two huge stone vessels (from a stratum of the fifteenth century B.C.), apparently designed for ablution purposes. In the bottom of each is a bowl-like cavity to facilitate clearing out the contents, while there is a useful drain-hole nearby. It was here evidently that the dwellers around made their morning ablutions, and we are reminded of similar contemporaneous stone water-receptacles at Nineveh, Tiryns, and elsewhere. The Canaanite religion, like the Babylonian, demanded cleanliness of person, and no one would dare to enter the sanctuary or supplicate God in any other state. The Israelites were equally scrupulous in such a matter, especially where ceremonial defilement or contact with holy things was concerned. There is no reference, certainly, either in the Old Testament or the Apocrypha, to large basins or baths in the modern and non-religious sense of the term, and any mention of bathing in such a sense refers only to rivers or pools, etc. (cf. Ex 2^{5}, 1 K 22^{38}, 2 K 5^{14}, etc.). In all other cases where the word 'bathing' occurs in the E.V., it means washing particular parts of the body with water, not the immersion of the whole of it. Unfortunately, the Hebrew of the Old Testament does not distinguish between the two processes, for both of which the word *raḥaṣ* is employed. At Megiddo the stone vessels must have been used for ablutions only—they are not large enough for bathing—and similar receptacles for family or communal use must have been in existence among the Israelites, for ablutions were carried out by them not only on the ground of ordinary cleanliness (cf. 2 S 11^{2}), and when about to visit superiors (cf. Ru 3^{3}), but particularly before appearing in God's presence for worship (cf. Gn 35^{2}).

Altar.—Adjoining the 'megara' referred to above, a sacrificial altar of unique form has been unearthed, dating in its inception from about 2000 B.C. It is a huge circular structure of rough stones, stated by the excavator to be 'about nine metres' (=29·53 feet) in diameter at its base, and 'about 2 metres' (=6·56 feet) high in its present form (which must be lower than the original height). The diameter decreases as the height increases, and there is a flight of steps to the top at the east side (here many animal bones were found). One remarkable circumstance, not noted so far by any one, is that the altar in the forecourt of Solomon's temple was precisely this diameter, for it was twenty cubits across at the base (2 Ch 4^{1}), and if the common measurement of a cubit be taken (17·72 in.),[1] this gives exactly 29·53 feet; and according to Ezk 43^{17} (if Ezekiel's temple be a recollection of Solomon's, which is likely), the steps were also on the east. This identical measurement may simply be a strange coincidence, but on the other hand it is not impossible that Solomon, who must have been well acquainted with Megiddo seeing that he restored its fortifications (1 K 9^{15}), took the large altar there as the basis of his own at Jerusalem, as King Ahaz did with the one at Damascus (2 K 16^{11}). If so, it is clear that much of the cultus which played an important part in Israelite worship was not peculiar to Israel but was based on Canaanite forms.

Cush and Cushan-Rishathaim.

Cush.—It is well known that 'Cush' (Hebrew *Kûsh*) in the Old Testament generally designates Ethiopia (=Egyptian *Kash* or *Kesh*), as in 2 K 19^{9}, Am 9^{7}, Is $18^{1ff.}$, etc. But according to Gn $10^{8ff.}$ and probably 2^{13}, there is good reason to believe that there was a Cush or Kash to the east or north-east of Palestine, and this is corroborated by the Amarna Letters where some of the references to 'Kashi' can only be interpreted in this sense (cf. No. 76, 12 ff.; 104, 17 ff.; 116, 67 ff., etc.). In a

[1] Hastings' one-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 968a.

communication to the 'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres' (7th July 1939), Professor Hrozný of Prague University has thrown much light on this question, and recent researches by others have added to it. The result goes to show that the district of the Caucasus, a great metal producing region, and of the Caspian Sea, was the principal centre from which successive waves of people named Kushites or Kashites (known in classical times as Cosseans or Kisseans, Greek Κοσσαῖοι, Κισσίοι) invaded a large part of the Fertile Crescent to the south. Crossing the Zagros Mountains, north of Elam, they descended upon Babylonia in the eighteenth century B.C., and took possession of it, forming the Third or Kassite Dynasty there, which lasted for nearly 600 years (from 1749 to 1171 B.C.), and were without doubt the authors of the celebrated 'Luriston' Bronzes. Some sections of them (for they were a conglomerate people, connected with the Hittites and other Indo-Europeans) also flowed into the Mitanni region (the Aram-Naharaim of the Bible, lying between the Tigris and Euphrates), and became the ruling caste there. Evidence of this penetration south, west, and east, appears in the widespread occurrence of the name 'Kush' or 'Kash.' It not only forms the second element of the word Caucasus (where the *Cau-* seems to signify 'forging,' cf. the Slavonic *Kovati*, 'forger'), but appears in Hindukush 'The Kush of the Hindus'; in Cassiterides or Tin Islands (the name given by the Phœnicians to the Scilly Islands, from *Kassiteros*, 'the Kassite metal'); in the place-name Kussar (probably modern *Aladja Euyuk* in Cappadocia), the first capital of the Hittites, a word which simply signifies 'the Kushites,' the termination *-ar* being a collective suffix; in the name *Kaskâya* (Kaskites), borne by a semi-nomad people in the Upper Euphrates region; and perhaps in the name 'Cossack' in southern Russia. The African Kush is probably explained by the fact that the inhabitants or rulers there came originally from the Caucasus region (a view that is well founded on other grounds). All this elucidates Gn 2^{13} R.V., where Cush is placed in the Caucasus (at the source of the Euphrates and Tigris), and where the river Gihon may be the Araxes. This region, at least, was the homeland of the Kushites or Kassites, and the text thus appears to contain an accurate and very ancient tradition. In Gn $10^{8ff.}$ the term Cush (in contrast to Cush, son of Ham, in v.[6]) is applied, not without reason, to Babylonia, over which the Kassites exercised hegemony, and the same is true of the term 'Kashi' in the Amarna texts.

Cushan-Rishathaim.—The question of the identity of this ruler (כּוּשַׁן רִשְׁעָתַיִם) in Jg 3^{8}, the first recorded oppressor of the Israelites not long after their entry into Canaan, naturally arises here. He is stated to have been king of Aram-Naharaim ('Aram of the two rivers'), *i.e.* Mitanni. The term 'Cushan' bears this out, for the kings of Mitanni were Cushites, and the termination *-an* is probably no more than the 'energetic' or emphatic suffix, which appears not only in Hebrew but in Arabic and early Aramaic texts. 'Rishathaim' seems to be simply the Hebrew perverted form of the name Artatama (king of Mitanni), for the scribe has replaced Arta, 'righteous order' (=Sanskrit *rita*) with the Hebrew word *resha'* (רֶשַׁע), 'wickedness,' in order to cast contempt on this ruler for his persecution. This is in accord with other instances of the same type of perversion in the Hebrew records (*e.g.* Bosheth, 'shamefulness,' for Baal), and is confirmed by the fact that the peculiar guttural ע, being Semitic, could not have occurred in the Mitanian king's name. The Septuagint, moreover, has Χουσαρσαθαιμ (*i.e.* Χοῦς Ἀρσαθαίμ), where Χοῦς is undoubtedly Kûsh (for Greek *sigma* [or *san* in Doric, etc.] represented the Hebrew *shin*, cf. Franz, *Elem. Epigr. Gr.*, p. 16), and Ἀρσα is merely a dialectic form of Ἀρθα or Ἀρτα, for in certain Greek dialects (such as Doric, Laconic, Ionic, and others, as well as Attic sometimes) the letter θ or τ was frequently changed into σ, which was preferred by numerous Greeks as being softer.[1] It seems to the writer, therefore, that in Cushan-Rishathaim we have Artatama II., who in his violent barbarism put his brother Tushratta to death, and began to reign in his stead about 1370 B.C. This identification strengthens the earlier date of the Exodus, making the Hebrew invasion identical with that of the Sa-gaz Habiru in the Amarna Letters.[2]

The reason for the attack on the Israelites, and the oppression of them, is thus explainable. Tushratta had waged war against the Hittites (cf. Amarna Letters, 17, 30 ff.), but his brother adopted the opposite policy, siding with them, and consequently endeavouring to prevent the Israelite penetration. He is believed to have reigned for eight or ten years.

[1] Thus, in Doric, we find σάλασσα for θάλασσα, σεῖος for θεῖος, παρσένος for παρθένος, etc.; in Ionic there is βυσσός for βυθός, etc.; and even in Attic, we have βασμός for βαθμός, etc. (cf. Ahrens, *De Dialecto Dorica*, § 7, 3; *D. Aeol.*, § 36, 2, 52, 3). Cf. also σήμερον for τήμερον, ναυσία for ναυτία, μέσαυλος for μέταυλος, etc.

[2] The writer prefers this solution to the earlier one suggested by him in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June 1924.

Contributions and Comments.

Note on Lay-Celebration of the Eucharist.

I. *Was there Lay-Celebration in the New Testament Church?*

The New Testament is silent as to the celebrant at Holy Communion, but lay-celebration seems to be implied, on the following grounds:

1. The sacramental conceptions of the New Testament are entirely corporate and only related to sacerdotal conceptions in the sense of the priesthood of the whole Church. The priesthood of the 'laity' would seem to be both *de jure* and *de facto*. The only account which gives any details of the celebration of the Lord's Supper is that of St. Paul in 1 Co 10 and 11. Here the corporate conception is fully stated: 'The cup which *we* bless,' 'the bread which *we* break.' In a conference which took place in 1900 between representative Anglicans and Free Churchmen, Dr. Fairbairn claimed that the language here used makes 'a careful distinction as to what the Apostle himself does, and what the corporate people do.'[1] In the same conference Dr. Headlam claimed that this primitive conception had in some measure been retained by the Eastern Churches, and made reference to the Russian theologian Khomiakoff, who said of the Orthodox Church, 'The seven sacraments are in reality not accomplished by any single individual who is worthy of the mercy of God, but by the whole Church in the person of an individual, even though he be unworthy.'[2] This is further borne out by the fact that in the Coptic Liturgy the people, by their responses, take a part and share in the whole consecration prayer.[3]

2. The ministry, in the Corinthian Church at least, appears to have been charismatic. Such a ministry, from the point of view of 'orders,' was virtually a lay-ministry. It would appear that 'the blessing' or prayer of consecration was being given in 'an unknown tongue,' and this St. Paul forbids.[4] Most scholars take this to refer to the Eucharistic prayer, to which the people said 'Amen.'[5] ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῇς πνεύματι ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ τό Ἀμὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ.

This is further borne out by the Didache which (whatever its date) prescribes an order for the two consecration prayers, but leaves the prophets (charismatic ministry) free to 'give thanks' as they are able.[6]

3. The picture which we have of the Jerusalem Church with its three thousand members 'continuing steadfastly in the breaking of the bread,' virtually presupposes lay administration at 'house-tables.'[7] The Jewish Passover, which must have been a kind of ante-type of the Eucharist, required no official priest for its celebration, and on practical grounds it does not seem possible for the Apostles themselves to have celebrated at all such 'house-tables.'

4. Some slight further evidence is afforded by the fact that some definite time seems to have elapsed between the setting up of Christian communities and the appointment by St. Paul of Presbyters within them. But it is hardly likely that these communities refrained from celebrating the Eucharist, which, at this stage, appears to have been the definitive, if not the only, form of specifically Christian worship.[8]

II. *Was Lay-Celebration ever practised in any part of the Christian Church before the Reformation?*

This question opens up an even deeper one. It is admitted that gradually the custom grew of reserving to ordained Bishops or Presbyters the right to celebrate. At the time of Ignatius it was probably the custom to reserve the right to the Bishop alone, and this was probably so also in Rome in Justin's day; but by the end of the second century Presbyters had equal right with the Bishop. The question is: Was this restriction a matter of orderliness, or was it a matter of sacerdotal function?

Dr. Burton Scott Easton is sure that the appearance of sacerdotal titles for Christian ministers was a consequence of the adoption of sacrificial terms for Christian worship, and that they were foreign to the New Testament.[9] The presumption of this is that originally the restriction of celebration to Bishops and Presbyters was a matter of orderliness and regularity and had nothing to do with validity as such. This is borne out by Tertullian, who takes it for granted that laics, under proper authority, may baptize and celebrate the Eucharist. That the reference is to such celebration is admitted by

[1] *Priesthood and Sacrifice*, 139. Pressensé in his *Church History* makes the same claim, ii. 224.
[2] *Ib.*, 161.
[3] See Brightman, *Liturgies*, 176–177.
[4] 1 Co 14^{16}.
[5] For an account of this practice see Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, cap. 67.
[6] *Didache*, cap. 10. [7] See Ac 2^{41-47}. [8] Ac 14.
[9] See his *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, 64.

Dr. Gore,[1] but he claims that it represents only Montanist views and practice. This is refuted by Dr. Lindsay.[2] Whilst in the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* laymen are forbidden to offer 'the thanksgiving,' in the Ethiopic version Deacons are allowed to do so,[3] and a Deacon for the purposes of this argument is virtually a layman.

Lay Baptism, in case of necessity, has never been in dispute (except in the Reformed Church), and Lay Absolution was a fairly common practice in the Middle Ages, and is defended by Albert the Great on the same grounds as Lay Baptism.[4] The fact that down to the close of the tenth century it was common for laymen, including women, to act as ministers of *viaticum* [5] is further testimony to the fact that what distinguished a layman from a cleric was not some *character indelibilis* possessed by the latter and not by the former, the absence of which in the layman prevented him from administering the Eucharist under all circumstances.

This conclusion is further strengthened when we remember that John Teutonicus claimed that a layman, if need be, could perform the sacrament of Confirmation.[6] Such practices had undoubtedly ceased during the later Middle Ages, and the Council of Trent put a definite end to them in refuting Luther's claim that if Marriage and Baptism could be celebrated by laymen, so might the Eucharist if circumstances demanded.[7] The Bull *Exsurge Domine* of the 15th June 1525 made the same refutation of Luther's thesis; but it is far from convincing, seeing that it has to resort to explaining 1 P 2^5 as purely figurative! It ought not to be forgotten that the strict Roman Catholic doctrine is that Christ our Lord is *minister principalis, primarius,* and that priests are only *ministri secundarii et instrumentales.*[8]

W. Robinson.
Overdale College,
Selly Oak, Birmingham.

[1] *The Church and the Ministry,* 188.

[2] *The Early History of the Church and Ministry,* 221 f. The passage from Tertullian's *de Exhort. Cast.* 7, is as follows: 'Vani erimus, si putaverimus quod sacerdotibus non liceat laicis licere. Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? . . . Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.'

[3] See Part 3^{26}.

[4] See *La Confession aux laiques dans l'église latine,* by A. Teetaert (1926).

[5] It must be remembered that the administration of the *viaticum* included hearing Confession and granting Absolution.

[6] See Fr. Gillman's *Die Lehre der Scholastik vom Spender der Firmung und des Weihesakramentes* (1920).

[7] Sessio. 7, Canon, 10.

[8] See St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa,* iii. q. 64, a. 9.

Note on Psalm xxxiv. 21.

'Evil shall slay the wicked'—a very consoling thought for the righteous, whether he be somewhat vindictive or merely satisfied to escape disaster. But the Hebrew suggests a further implication—תְּמוֹתֵת רִשְׁעַ רָעָה. Why the form מוֹתֵת instead of the familiar הָמִית? The Po'lel occurs in seven passages in the Bible: Jg 9^{54}, 1 S 14^{13} 17^{51}, 2 S $1^{9.\,10.\,16}$, Jer 20^{17}, and Ps 109^{16}. Naturally we may look to the historical passages for any special *nuance* in the form. Let us take them in detail.

Jg 9^{54}. Abimelech has had his skull crushed by a tile thrown by a woman, and hastily appeals to his armourbearer to kill him, lest it be said that he died at a woman's hand.

1 S 14^{13}. Jonathan and his armourbearer have scrambled up into the Philistine fort, and Jonathan is laying about him in berserk fury, while the armourbearer comes behind (note the circumstantial clause) and cuts the throats of the victims as they lie helpless on the ground.

1 S 17^{51}. David has stunned the Philistine giant with a sling-stone, and runs to the prostrate form, seizes his sword, kills him, and cuts off his head.

2 S 1. In the account the Amalekite gives of Saul's death, the king is desperately wounded, and appeals to the other to make an end of him. The Amalekite does so, because he sees that Saul cannot survive.

The common feature in all these passages is that the victim is already badly, it may be mortally, injured. The verb, then, implies giving the *coup de grâce* to one who is already in a desperate case, or is at least helpless. We can hardly doubt that the same element is present also in the other three instances; here, in particular, the Psalmist regards the wicked as being already ruined, perhaps on the verge of death. What calamity does (cf. v.[19]) is to distinguish between the righteous and the wicked. The one survives; the other, being already under the shadow of death, perishes. Sin is a deadly thing, whose presence means certain destruction, like the ichneumon grub within the caterpillar. All that disaster accomplishes is to make this clear and finish the work already more than half completed by sin.

Theodore H. Robinson.
Cardiff.

The Plan of the First Epistle of John.

I was greatly interested to read Mr. Oke's article on 'The Plan of the First Epistle of John' in the

April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. It was in 1935 that I wrote a 'Commentary on the Johannine Epistles' in Japanese in the series of the *Modern New Testament Commentary*, edited by the Rev. Mr. Shozo Arakawa, in which I advocated the orderly plan of the First Epistle and suggested the possibility of displacement in the present text. The basic thought was the same as Mr. Oke's, and the only difference was the choice of the displaced section. While he finds it in 2^{12-17}, I find it in 4^{1-6}. And I am greatly tempted to present my own case for general consideration.

As was the case with Mr. Oke it was from the study of Law's *Tests of Life* that I began to hold the view of the orderliness of the Epistle. I owe much to him for my Johannine study. But as to his view of the three cycles, I could hardly accept it from the outset. It is only in his first two divisions that we find the cycles of three thoughts—Righteousness, Love, and Belief. In spite of his contention it is hard to find the cycle of the same thoughts in his third division, as is evident from the analysis given by him as follows :

First Cycle. Walking in the Light	1^5–2^{28}
A. Tested by Righteousness	1^8–2^6
B. Tested by Love	2^{7-17}
C. Tested by Belief	2^{18-28}
Second Cycle. Divine Sonship	2^{29}–4^6
A. Tested by Righteousness	2^{29}–3^{10a}
B. Tested by Love	$3^{10b-24a}$
C. Tested by Belief	3^{24b}–4^6
Third Cycle. Interrelations of Love, Belief, and Righteousness	4^7–5^{21}
I. Love	4^7–5^{3a}
A. Genesis of Love	4^{7-12}
B. Synthesis of Love and Belief	4^{13-16}
C. Effects, Motives, and Manifestations of Love	4^{17}–5^{3a}
II. Belief	5^{3b-21}
A. The Power, Content, Basis, and Issue of Christian Belief	5^{2b-12}
B. Conscious Certainties of Christian Belief	5^{13-21}

Thus the order of the third cycle is quite different from that of the first two cycles. It deals with only two thoughts—Love and Belief—and does not, in a strict sense, constitute a cycle.

It was this incongruity of Dr. Law's third cycle that led me to consider the problem of the plan afresh. Then a thought occurred to me that there might be displacement in the Epistle, and I came to assume it in 4^{1-6}.

After a careful study I have found in the Epistle two main divisions, *i.e.* 1^5–2^{28} and 2^{29}–5^{12}, besides its prologue (1^{1-4}) and the Epilogue (5^{13-21}); the first division dealing with the problem of Koinonia, the second that of Sonship. It is these two divisions, it seems to me, that constitute 'Cycles,' both dealing with the same thoughts in the same order, namely, Sin, Brotherly Love, and Faith in the Incarnate Christ.

This order is kept close in Division One, as you will see in the following analysis.

Division One. Koinonia	1^5–2^{28}
1. Conviction of Sin	1^5–2^2
(*a*) Basis of Koinonia	1^{5-7}
(*b*) Sense of Sin	1^{8-10}
(*c*) The Reconciler of Sin	2^{1-2}
2. Practice of Brotherly Love	2^{3-17}
(*a*) Neo-Legalism	2^{3-6}
(*b*) A New Commandment	2^{7-11}
(*c*) Exhortations	2^{12-14}
(*d*) Warning	2^{15-17}
3. Faith in the Incarnate Christ	2^{18-28}
(*a*) Separatists	2^{18-19}
(*b*) Fallacy of Separatists	2^{20-23}
(*c*) Exhortation to keep Traditional Faith	2^{34-25}
(*d*) Exhortation to obey Revelation of the Holy Spirit	2^{26-28}

Division Two follows practically the same order. But there is a passage which breaks this order, namely, 4^{1-6}. This passage deals with the subject of the Incarnate Christ, and yet is placed between the passages dealing with Brotherly Love. If we remove this to the end of ch. 4, we will have the same cycle of thoughts in Division Two as in Division One. Thus :

Division Two—Divine Sonship	2^{29}–5^{12}
1. Conquest of Sin	2^{29}–3^{12}
(*a*) Nature of Sonship	2^{29}
(*b*) Mystery of Sonship	3^{1-3}
(*c*) Life of Children of God	3^{4-6}
(*d*) Warning against Separatist Faith	3^{7-9}
(*e*) Children of God and Children of the Devil	3^{10-12}
2. Practice of Brotherly Love	3^{13-24} 4^{7-21}
(*a*) Hate	3^{13-15}
(*b*) Brotherly Love	3^{16-18}
(*c*) Fruits of Brotherly Love	3^{19-24}
(*d*) Source of Brotherly Love	4^{7-10}
(*e*) Love and Fellowship with God	4^{11-16}
(*f*) Love and Fear	4^{17-18}
(*g*) Conclusion	4^{19-21}

3. Upholding Faith in the Incarnate Christ . . .	4^{1-6} 5^{1-12}
(*a*) Spirit of Truth and Spirit of Error . . .	4^{1-6}
(*b*) Conquering Faith . .	5^{1-6}
(*c*) Witness to the Faith .	5^{7-12}

Now, as to 4^{1-6}, it is practically of the same length as Jn 12^{36b-44} which is generally accepted as a dislocated section in our present text. The number of Greek letters in the former is 615, and that in the latter 600, which fact of similar length would, I think, substantiate the possibility of dislocation of 4^{1-6}.

What is interesting is the fact that this new arrangement gives us a very sensible reading of the Epistle. The connexion between 3^{13-24} and 4^{7-21} and between 4^{1-6} and 5^{1-12} is very natural and helps us to understand the Epistle.

Regarding Mr. Oke's contention I am not yet convinced. The section 2^{12-17} is practically of the same length as 4^{1-6}, and we may assume its displacement. But there arise difficulties if we set it apart into two, *i.e.* 2^{12-13a} and 2^{13b-17}. The section 2^{12-13a} seems to be too short as a unit for dislocation, since it contains only 99 Greek letters, to be written only in a few lines. Considering the fact that the shortest section of dislocation in the Fourth Gospel (3^{31-36}) contains as many as 433 letters, I fail to see how such a short section as the former could result in dislocation.

Furthermore, to separate 2^{12-14} into two would seem to disregard the author's characteristic style. We find there a repetition of exhortations, and often wonder at this. But this is not, I think, a mere repetition. Is it not rather a repetition due to the author's literary characteristic? To use Dr. Law's terminology it seems to be the case of two 'cycles' of exhortations that we find there. We ought rather to keep the section as it is, or, we will do a violence to the author's style.

In writing this I do not wish to discredit Mr. Oke. But for his article I would not have dared to write this note. It is because I agree with him in his basic idea that I am submitting this for general consideration and criticism. KOZUE TOMOI.

Japan Baptist Theological Seminary, Denen Chofu, Omori Ku, Tokyo.

The Lord's Prayer: A Study in Sources.

MOST scholars regard Luke's, the shorter version of the Lord's Prayer, as more primitive than Matthew's. M'Neile, for instance, remarks that 'the tendency of liturgical formulas is towards enrichment rather than abbreviation.' It has also been urged that Luke would not have omitted the additional clauses if he had known them. This argument holds good as against the theory that both Matthew and Luke were dependent on Q, or that Q contained the longer version. But Matthew may have used M, and Luke Q; *i.e.* Matthew preferred the longer version though he probably knew both, whilst Luke only knew the shorter version. Or Matthew may be dependent on M, whilst Luke used L. On either supposition Matthew and Luke could be held guiltless of addition or substraction.

What documents, then, did the two writers use? Principal Vincent Taylor includes the Lukan version of the Lord's Prayer in his reconstruction of L. This would leave either Q or M for the Matthæan version.[1] But there are good reasons for thinking that Luke was not dependent on L, but on Q. And this would appear to involve the use of M by Matthew.

Professor T. W. Manson has argued (*The Teaching of Jesus*) that Jesus never openly used the name 'Father' before Peter's Confession. But an examination of L as reconstructed by Taylor reveals that, with the exception of the Lord's Prayer, all the instances of the name in that document occur on the occasion of the Last Supper. Now Peter's Confession and the Last Supper are alike crises in the life of Jesus and His disciples. It is psychologically likely that Jesus would use the name more frequently (or perhaps one ought to say, less infrequently) on just those occasions. May it not well be that L preserved the tradition that Jesus called God 'Father' only on the occasion of the Last Supper? If so, the Lord's Prayer in Luke, is taken not from L, but from Q.[2]

One may adduce the further evidence:

(*a*) If Q did contain the Lord's Prayer, which is highly probable, Luke would surely know it. Why, then, should he prefer the shorter version of L? Is the Lord's Prayer, indeed, the sort of 'saying' to be expected in L as much as in Q?

(*b*) Noteworthy, also, is the 'bunching' of the instances of 'Father' in Q as preserved by Luke 10–12,

[1] Merely in view of what is said above, it is preferable to think of M. If the longer version was in Q, and therefore probably known to Luke, it is difficult to account for his choice of the shorter version. But see further, below.

[2] Unless Jesus did not teach the Prayer until the Supper, which is in itself improbable; moreover, it is difficult to account for the dislocation in Luke.

in which, of course, the Lord's Prayer occurs. The only isolated instance is 6^{36}, which occurs in the Sermon on the Plain and is presumably dislocated.

(*c*) All the instances of 'Father' in L (not counting the Lord's Prayer as from L) are combined with 'my' or 'our.' The other documents (taken together) are fairly evenly divided between πατήρ simpliciter and πατήρ with the possessive pronoun. But the Lord's Prayer in Luke has the simple πάτερ. We appear to be justified in thinking that Luke was dependent on Q for his version of the Lord's Prayer.

Now let us turn to the Matthæan version of the Prayer. Numerous parallels to Jewish prayers have been noticed by the commentators. Matthew's version of the Prayer is, indeed, Jewish in sentiment and liturgical in form. The evidence seems to point to a dependence upon M rather than Q.

The following points are perhaps worthy of notice:

(*a*) 'Our father which art in heaven' is typical of M in phraseology. Apart from the Lord's Prayer, there are in Matthew nineteen instances of the phrase πατήρ plus the possessive pronoun. All of them but four ($6^{26.\ 32}$ 7^{11} 10^{29}) occur in what are clearly M passages. The four exceptions may be explained either by the supposition that Matthew himself, under the influence of M, carried the phrase over into the other material, which did not contain the possessive pronoun, or by scribal assimilation. Similarly ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς, or its equivalent ὁ πατὴρ ὁ [ἐπ]ουράνιος occurs twenty times of which fourteen are in M. The exceptions may again be explained.[1] The balance of probability, therefore, is that the Lord's Prayer in Matthew is derived from M.

(*b*) 'Give us this day our daily bread.' It seems likely that the original Prayer, as taught by Jesus, was, 'Give us our bread for the (coming) day,' *i.e.* Luke's version with the omission of τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. And this, one would suggest is what Luke found in Q. Then either he altered the difficult ἐπιούσιον[2] to τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, which is a Lukan phrase, and it found its way back into the text, or he simply added τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν as an explanation. Matthew's version, on the other hand, is quite liturgical. Even if it was not liturgical as Matthew found it, it soon became so. The addition of σήμερον[3] and the alteration of δίδου to δός changes the Prayer from a general request for food to a liturgy to be used every morning. One may suspect M.

(*c*) 'Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.' Luke has ἁμαρτίας for ὀφειλήματα. This may be an alteration of the original due either to Luke or his source. The Matthæan ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν is retained in a more elegant form as παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. The equivalence of 'debt' and 'sin' is quite Jewish, as is proved from the Targums (חובה).

(*d*) 'Deliver us from the evil one.'[4] This is probably an addition to the original Prayer. It is of a thoroughly Jewish character, and may have been added either as an explanation of the preceding phrase or to balance it. Klein remarks that it is unlikely for a Jewish prayer to end with πονηροῦ, and therefore pleads for the genuineness of the doxology. This is neither probable nor necessary. The premiss goes to prove, rather, that this second limb of the petition is not genuine.

Our conclusions from these two lines of argument are:

(i) Luke was indebted to Q for his version of the Lord's Prayer.

(ii) Matthew, though he probably knew the Q version, preferred M.

(iii) Q retains, on the whole, the more primitive version. M's version is liturgical, and was possibly developed in a Jewish Christian community.

C. G. SHEWARD.

Barrow-in-Furness.

[1] Mk 11^{25} is probably a scribal assimilation to Mt 6^{14}.

[2] The derivation of this word from ἐπὶ τὴν οὖσαν, für den betreffenden Tag (bestimmt), by Blass-Debrunner (*NTliche Gramm.*, para, 123. 1) is not satisfactory. The adjective ἐπιμήνιος is not a true analogy. Μήν enters into the composition of ἐπιμήνιος; nor is there any evidence that ἡμέρα was ever understood with οὖσα. Moreover, before οὖσα the iota would probably be elided to form ἐπούσιος. It seems better to derive the word from ἐπιέναι. Note Jerome's comment on Matthew, that the Gospel to the Hebrews had 'mahar,' *i.e.* 'crastinum,' 'ut sit sensus: panem nostrum crastinum, *i.e.* futurum, da nobis hodie.'

[3] Even if it is derived from ἐπιέναι, ἐπιούσιος need not mean 'of the following day' ('Brot für den folgenden Tag,' Blass-Debrunner, *loc. cit.*) in the sense of 'bread for to-morrow.' *E.g.*, Plato, *Crito*, 44A: Οὐ τοίνυν τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας οἶμαι αὐτὸ ἥξειν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐτέρας, 'Well, I think it (the ship) will not come in to-day, but to-morrow.' See also Pr 27^{1}, where ἡ ἐπιοῦσα = Heb. יום.

[4] On the whole 'the evil one' is to be preferred; *i.e.* τοῦ πονηροῦ is masculine. Even if, as Klein suggests, 'evil' means 'the evil impulse' (יצר הרע) it may still be masculine; the evil יצר is personalized.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.